

GENERAL LIBRARY
MAY 10 1919
UNIV. OF MICH.

The Classical Journal

PUBLISHED BY THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE MIDDLE WEST AND SOUTH
WITH THE CO-OPERATION OF THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND
AND THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE PACIFIC STATES

Volume XIV

MAY 1919

Number 8

Editorial 465

Was Athens in the Age of Pericles Aristocratic?

La Rue Van Hook 472

Latin Examinations as Tests of Intelligence

Nelson G. McCrea 498

Rhythm versus Rhyme

Karl P. Harrington 513

Notes

Sidon and the Sidonians in Homer

John A. Scott 525

Some Corsican Illustrations of Greek Literature

Sidney W. Deane 526

Caesar vi. 23

H. A. Sanders 527

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, LONDON AND EDINBURGH
THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA, TOKYO, OSAKA, KYOTO,
FUKUOKA, SENDAI
THE MISSION BOOK COMPANY, SHANGHAI

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

Published by the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, with the co-operation
of the Classical Association of New England and the Classical Association
of the Pacific States

Managing Editors

FRANK J. MILLER
The University of Chicago

ARTHUR T. WALKER
The University of Kansas

For New England

MONROE N. WETMORE
Williams College

For the Pacific States

HERBERT C. NUTTING
The University of California

Associate Editors

GEORGE H. CHASE
Harvard University

*FREDERICK C. EASTMAN
The University of Iowa

CLARENCE W. GLEASON
Roxbury Latin School, Boston

DANIEL W. LOTHMAN
East High School, Cleveland

WALTER MILLER
The University of Missouri

JOHN A. SCOTT
Northwestern University

GILBERT C. SGOOGIN
The University of Missouri

JULIANNE A. ROLLER
Franklin High School, Portland, Oregon

BERTHA GREEN
Hollywood High School, Los Angeles

*Deceased.

The *Classical Journal* is published monthly except in July, August, and September at the University of Chicago Press, 5750 Ellis Avenue, Chicago, Illinois. The subscription price is \$2.50 per year; the price of single copies is 30 cents. Orders for service of less than a half-year will be charged at the single-copy rate. Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States, Mexico, Cuba, Porto Rico, Panama Canal Zone, Republic of Panama, Hawaiian Islands, Philippine Islands, Guam, Samoan Islands, Shanghai. Postage is charged extra as follows: For Canada, 15 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$2.65); on single copies 2 cents (total 32 cents). For all other countries in the Postal Union, 24 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$2.74); on single copies 3 cents (total 33 cents). Patrons are requested to make all remittances payable to The University of Chicago Press in postal or express money orders or bank drafts.

The following are authorized to quote the prices indicated:

For the British Empire: THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, Fetter Lane, London, E.C. 4. Yearly subscriptions, including postage, 11s. 3d. each; single copies, including postage, 1s. 4d. each.

For Japan and Korea: THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA, 11 to 16 Nihonbashi Tori Sanchome, Tokyo, Japan. Yearly subscriptions, including postage, Yen 5.50 each; single copies, including postage, Yen 0.66 each.

For China: THE MISSION BOOK COMPANY, 18 Peking Road, Shanghai. Yearly subscriptions \$2.50; single copies 30 cents, or their equivalents in Chinese money. Postage extra, if mailed direct outside of Shanghai, on yearly subscriptions 24 cents, on single copies 3 cents.

Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and when the reserve stock will permit. Deliveries are not guaranteed within the war zones of Europe nor in other countries where transportation is disturbed by conditions incident to war.

Business correspondence should be addressed as follows:

1. Concerning membership in the Classical Association of the Middle West and South to LOUIS E. LORD, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio. The territory of the Association includes Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming. The membership fee is \$2.00 per year to residents of this territory.

2. Concerning membership in the Classical Association of New England to MONROE N. WETMORE, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass. The membership fee is \$2.00 per year to residents of this territory.

3. Concerning membership in the Classical Association of the Pacific States to JAMES T. ALLEN, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. The territory of this association includes California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, and Arizona. The membership fee is \$2.00 per year to resident of this territory.

4. Concerning subscriptions (not related to membership) to THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS, Chicago, Ill.

Communications for the editors and manuscripts should be sent either to FRANK J. MILLER, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., or to ARTHUR T. WALKER, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kan.; from New England contributors to MONROE N. WETMORE, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass., and from the Pacific States to HERBERT C. NUTTING, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.

Fifty reprints of articles will be furnished *gratis* to authors. Additional copies, if ordered in advance of publication, will be supplied at cost.

Entered as second-class matter, May 16, 1906, at the Post-office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of July 16, 1894.

Acceptance for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on August 23, 1918.

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

VOLUME XIV

MAY 1919

NUMBER 8

Editorial

THE ATLANTA MEETING

The Fifteenth Annual Meeting of our Association, held in Atlanta for three days beginning with Thursday, April 10, was a notable success. The local committee had made careful plans for our comfort and entertainment; the hospitality shown the visitors was such as would be expected in Georgia's capital. From the hour of arrival to that of departure, there was not a dull moment. As a fitting supplement to each day's rather strenuous formal program, wise and generous provision had been made for social relaxation. Our president, Professor Campbell Bonner, of the University of Michigan, was unavoidably absent on account of illness, but the duties of his office were tactfully administered by Professor Charles E. Little, of the George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville.

At the first session held Thursday afternoon in the auditorium of the Piedmont Hotel, Mr. M. L. Brittain, Superintendent of Schools for the State of Georgia, delivered an address on "The Value of Classics in the Schools." This address was of peculiar value as coming from a man who long was head of the department of languages in the Atlanta Boys' High School and who now is thoroughly conversant with the conditions and needs of the secondary schools throughout his state. He thinks that the arguments against classical training have had more weight in our higher institutions of learning than in the secondary schools. He feels

that not more than a fourth of the pupils in the high schools have any special aptitude for languages. Accordingly, in the larger schools, where there is a wide choice of electives, the classics will continue to have a prominent place; but in the smaller schools of the village and the country, science and the study of nature will of necessity be most emphasized.

The address of welcome was delivered Thursday evening by Bishop Warren A. Candler, Chancellor of Emory University, who emphasized the value of classical studies as a foundation for all learned professions. This he illustrated by citing the examples of numerous statesmen and men of science. Professor Little spoke in reply to Bishop Candler's very cordial address of welcome. At the same session, in the absence of Professor Thomas H. Billings, of the University of Chattanooga, who was on the program, Professor Alfred W. Mildner, of the University of Mississippi, kindly consented to read a very instructive paper on "The Father of History."

Friday was a very full day. The morning session, held at Emory University, was devoted to "A Conference on Methods of Latin Teaching in High Schools and Normal Schools," under the direction of Professor Josiah B. Game, of the Florida State College for Women, Tallahassee. With his usual skill, Professor Game had already aroused much interest in the topics to be discussed, and when, after the formal papers, the numerous questions raised were thrown open for general discussion, it constantly required keen watchfulness to decide among the numerous contestants for the floor. Particularly noticeable was the interest shown by high-school teachers, who from personal experience had many practical suggestions to offer. While some spoke in defense of the standard Latin requirements, as indicated in our program, the majority seemed to favor a smaller amount of text with the consequent opportunity for more thorough preparation and drill. One eminent teacher from a preparatory school maintained, rightly I think, that the college had the right to set any standard for entrance which it saw fit, and the preparatory teacher, in turn, had a perfect right to teach as much of anything in any way as might enable the pupil to meet the standard of excellence required

by the college. Of special interest was the talk on "Some Suggestions for Teachers of Latin in the High Schools," by Professor Harry Clark, State Inspector of High Schools in Tennessee. Professor Clark is a classically trained man who is a teacher of Education in the State University, and Tennessee can indeed be congratulated that its secondary schools come under the inspection of a man of his deep sense of responsibility and of his high ideals.

At noon the members of the Association enjoyed a real, old-fashioned barbecue, prepared before their eyes, on the campus of Emory University. The carvers and the ladies in charge of the serving displayed all the generous traits of the *δαιτρός* and the *αἰδοίη τρυφή* of Homeric times. After they had dispelled their desire for food and drink, the members of the Association again assembled to hear the papers scheduled for the afternoon. At the close of this session, automobiles, provided by the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce, were in waiting to carry us through the beautiful and historic city.

Friday evening a place of meeting was furnished by Agnes Scott College, and of considerable interest for the history of classical studies in America was the paper of Professor Milton W. Humphreys, of the University of Virginia, dealing with "The Roman Pronunciation of Latin." Professor Humphreys made it pretty clear that he, while a young teacher at Washington College, was really the first to introduce the Roman pronunciation of Latin into this country. At the conclusion of the program a very delightful reception was tendered the members of the Association by the faculty and the seniors of Agnes Scott College.

On Saturday morning Dean Andrew F. West spoke on "The Proposed Classical League," which was officially indorsed by our Association. Professor W. R. Webb, of the Webb School, Bellbuckle, Tennessee, read a paper on "Colonel William Bingham as a Latin Teacher." This paper called forth frequent applause, and it was voted that it be published as soon as practicable in the *Classical Journal*.

At the business session a question of vital importance came up—the desirability and feasibility of breaking up our Association into two closely related groups. Some members have long

felt that the extensive territory covered by our Association will always necessitate a place of meeting inaccessible to the great majority of the members. Some felt that in case there could be organized a Southern section and a Middle Western section, each could provide a place of meeting which would be within reasonable distance for all its members. The supporters of this plan pointed out that at the present time few high-school teachers are able to attend a distant meeting. They rightly feel that the cause of classical studies is closely bound up with the high school and that it is of the greatest importance that college teachers and high-school teachers should be able to meet and discuss their common problems. Others thought that at the present time the united effort of the larger territory should not be dissipated; that it was more inspiring to come in contact with teachers from somewhat remote places; that local advancement could be still more effectively brought about if the classical teachers, in addition to their work in our present organization, would ally themselves with any teachers' organization now existing in the various states; that experience elsewhere had shown that even within a restricted territory there are inevitable obstacles to prevent most teachers from attending even a nearby place of meeting; that after all, distances are merely relative. The proposal for separation came from certain members of the southern states and strongest opposition came from the same section. It seemed unwise to take final action before the general sentiment of the South was ascertained. A committee was appointed to report on this matter for action at our next annual meeting.

Saturday afternoon Director Charles Upson Clark, of the American Academy in Rome, gave an illustrated lecture, describing "How Italy Protected Her Works of Art."

The following officers were elected for the coming year: President, Professor Gordon J. Laing, The University of Chicago; First Vice-President, Professor G. C. Scoggin, The University of Missouri; Secretary-Treasurer, Professor Louis E. Lord, Oberlin College.

G. C. S.

THE FOURTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE CLASSICAL
ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND

This meeting was held at Wheaton College, Norton, Massachusetts, on Friday and Saturday, March 28 and 29. The least that can be said of it is that the Association has never held a meeting more successful in every way. In spite of the sudden return of real winter on Friday morning, 112 members and guests of the Association signed the registration book. Many others failed to register, though they were in attendance. We have had generous hosts in other years, but never has a more thoughtfully planned entertainment been lavished upon us. A part of this was referred to on Saturday afternoon by our President, when he said that the problem of the high cost of living seemed to be solved in Norton. He had been at Wheaton College for two days, and he had not been able to spend a cent. Many of the college students gave up three days of their vacation in order to assist in entertaining us.

Friday evening will be long remembered in the annals of the Association. After dinner there were brief but excellent addresses by President Cole, of Wheaton College, by Professor Howes, President of the Association, by Professor Knapp, the delegate from the Classical Association of the Atlantic States, and by Dr. Gallagher, of Thayer Academy. After this, in the room used for our regular sessions, Professor Charles R. Lanman, of Harvard University, gave an illustrated lecture on "Elementary Grammars: A Few Words on the Gentle Art of Making Things Seem Harder Than They Are." It was highly entertaining, as well as instructive. The address will appear in the columns of the *Journal*, where the charm of its delivery must be imagined by the reader. We then adjourned to the college chapel, and Professor H. G. Tucker gave an organ recital, which was highly appreciated by all. The evening's entertainment ended with a reception at the President's house, by President and Mrs. Cole.

The papers were of the usual high quality. Two innovations adopted this year seem to have met with particular success. First, the whole of Friday afternoon, after Professor Knapp had delivered the greetings from the Classical Association of the Atlantic States,

was devoted to Greek. Secondly, each paper was, at its conclusion, open for discussion, and all papers were discussed, most of them by many members. The discussions were never long and wearisome but always crisp, to the point, and illuminating.

At the business session on Friday morning the Association adopted the following resolution, which we hope will prove of interest to and be adopted by each of the other three regional Associations:

For the purpose of bringing about closer affiliation and co-operation between the four great regional Associations the adoption of the following plan is recommended: The constitution of the Secretary-Treasurers of the four Associations as the nucleus of a council to be called into full being when any joint action, in any direction, by the four regional Associations seems desirable and possible. To this nucleus may be added, by action of the Executive Committee of each Association, a desired number of other members to constitute the full council. The actions of this council shall not be binding on any one of the four regional Associations until said action has been approved, either by the Executive Committee of each Association, in the interim between the annual meetings, or by the annual meeting of the Association itself.

One matter in particular that might be done by the joint action of the four associations is the securing of an adequate series of measurements of Latin and non-Latin pupils. This is an undertaking too great for any one association to attempt. The four associations, working in unison, would need a vast amount of outside assistance. If properly done, it would command respect and be of tremendous value to our cause. A year ago the Classical Association of New England appointed a committee to study this problem. At this meeting the committee reported that no definite steps had been taken, owing to the fact that the experts who would have to conduct the investigations were all occupied with war work. Now that the war seems to be practically over, the task ought to be undertaken at once and with vigor.

On Saturday morning Dean Andrew F. West addressed the Association on the proposed American Classical League. After Dean West had finished his argument in favor of the League, the Association adopted by unanimous vote the following resolu-

tion: "That the Classical Association of New England approve the formation of the proposed American Classical League, provided the constitution of the proposed League shall contain a provision for representation from each of the four great regional Associations, said representation to consist of some member of each regional Classical Association chosen by the Association itself, at its annual meeting." After some discussion the following suggestion to the Classical Conference that is to meet at Milwaukee during the first week of July, in connection with the meeting of the National Education Association and to frame the League's constitution, was also voted without dissent: "That the Classical Association of New England recommend that the Executive Committee of the proposed American Classical League shall not contain more than twelve members in all and that the constitution shall definitely state that the annual meeting shall be held in connection with the annual meeting of the National Education Association."

The officers elected for the coming year were: President, Charles S. Knox, St. Paul's School, Concord, N. H.; Vice-President, Professor Haven D. Brackett, Clark College, Worcester, Mass.; Secretary-Treasurer, Professor George E. Howes, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.; Executive Committee (for two years), Professor Karl P. Harrington, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn., and Miss Ruth B. Franklin, Rogers High School, Newport, R. I. The other members of the Executive Committee, whose terms expire in 1920, are Miss M. M. Pickering, Brimmer School, Boston, Mass., and Miss Lillian M. Sleeper, High School, Manchester, N. H.

The annual meeting in 1920 will be held at Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.

M. N. W.

WAS ATHENS IN THE AGE OF PERICLES ARISTOCRATIC?

BY LARUE VAN HOOK
Columbia University

The majority of the numerous books which deal with Athenian political and social life in the latter part of the fifth century B.C. convey to student and to reader the general, but emphatic, impression that the *polis* Athens, while theoretically a democracy, was, generally speaking, an aristocracy. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that the composite picture of Athens under Pericles, as represented in the traditional view of the handbooks, reveals a society brilliant in its achievements, but quite selfishly constituted, and gravely defective, save from the viewpoint of the favored few. Profound social distinctions, even among the citizens themselves, are insisted upon. The conception still is widely prevalent that the *élite* of Athenian society, few but fit, led a life of glorious but intensely selfish leisure, which was their lordly prerogative as the result of the ruthless exploitation of all professional men, artists, producers, traders, artisans, workers, resident aliens, and slaves. Almost everywhere we find the time-honored assertion that in Athens all work was despised, labor was condemned, the workers were disdained, and, in fact, that *any* service for which financial remuneration was received was in disrepute and branded the doer with a humiliating social stigma. The free man is supposed to have done little or no work, for surely the aristocratic citizen must have a completely independent and carefree existence for his manifold political, social, and religious duties.

Let me now present some typical quotations from some recent books on Athens which give this false, or exaggerated, as I think, impression of the nature of Athenian society in the second half of the fifth century B.C., in that they assert that it was essentially aristocratic. In the ninth edition (1915) of that very popular, widely influential, and, in many respects, admirable little book,

The Greek View of Life by Mr. Lowes Dickinson, we read (italics are mine in every case): "In the Greek conception the citizen was an aristocrat. His excellence was thought to consist in public activity; and to the performance of public duties he ought therefore to be able to devote *the greater part of his time and energy*. But the existence of such a privileged class involved the existence of a class of producers to support them; and *the producers, by the nature of their calling, be they slave or free, were excluded from the life of the perfect citizen*. They had not the necessary leisure to devote to public business; neither had they the opportunity to acquire the mental and physical qualities which would enable them to transact it worthily. They were therefore regarded by the Greeks as an inferior class. . . . In Athens the most democratic of all the Greek communities, though they were admitted to the citizenship and enjoyed considerable political influence, *they never appear to have lost the stigma of social inferiority*. And the distinction which was more or less definitely drawn in practice *between the citizens proper and the productive class* was even more emphatically affirmed in theory" (pp. 74-75). "The obverse of the Greek citizen, who realized in the state the highest life, was *an inferior class of producers who realized only the means to subsistence*" (p. 75). "The *inferiority* of the artisan and the trader was further emphasized by the fact that *they were excluded by their calling* from the cultivation of the higher personal qualities; from the training of the body by gymnastics and of the mind by philosophy; *from habitual conversance with public affairs*; from that perfect balance, in a word, of the physical, intellectual, and moral powers, which was only to be attained by a process of *self-culture, incompatible with the pursuance of a trade for bread*" (p. 82). "The existence of the Greek citizen depended upon that of an inferior class who were regarded, not as ends in themselves, but as means to his perfection." "The aim of modern societies is not to separate off a privileged class of citizens, set free by the labour of others to live the perfect life, but rather to distribute impartially to all the burdens and advantages of the state, so that every one shall be at once a labourer for himself and a citizen of the state. But this idea is clearly incompatible with the Greek conception of the

citizen" (p. 130). "It is because labour with the hands or at the desk distorts or impairs the body, and the petty cares of a calling pursued for bread pervert the soul, that so *strong a contempt was felt by the Greeks for manual labour and trade.*" "If then the artisan . . . in Athens never altogether threw off *the stigma of inferiority attaching to his trade*, the reason was that the life he was compelled to lead was incompatible with the Greek conception of excellence" (p. 134). "The Greeks, on the whole, were quite content to sacrifice the majority to the minority. Their position was fundamentally aristocratic; they exaggerated rather than minimized the distinctions between men, the freeman and the slave, the gentleman and the artisan, regarding them as natural and fundamental, not as the casual product of circumstances. The 'equality' which they sought was proportional, not arithmetical, not of equal rights to all." "In a modern state it is different though class distinctions are clearly enough marked, yet the point of view from which they are regarded is fundamentally different. They are attributed rather to accidents of fortune than to varieties of nature. The artisan, for example, ranks no doubt lower than the professional man; but no one maintains that he is a different kind of being incapable by nature, as Aristotle asserts, of the characteristic excellence of man" (p. 79).

In *Greek Ideals*,¹ by Mr. C. Delisle Burns, a study of Athenian social life of the period under consideration, the Greek aristocratic conception of individual liberty is likewise, I believe, over-emphasized. Thus we find the statements: "It seemed essential that liberty and equality should only be the right of *a few males*. . . . Slaves and *workingmen had no time and no developed capacity for the 'good life'*" (p. 76). "Society was conceived only in terms . . . of *a small social caste*" (p. 109). "The Athenian citizen might object to doing manual labour" (p. 112).

Similar assertions are common. Thus Mr. Edwards in Whibley's *Companion to Greek Studies*: "The prejudice against trades and handicrafts was most pronounced in Sparta: elsewhere, though the political disabilities might be reduced or removed, the *social stigma was scarcely diminished*—indeed, even the fullest develop-

¹ (1917) Reviewed by Van Hook in *Classical Weekly*, XI, 207.

ment of democracy at Athens did but stereotype the conventional horror of hard work, and proclaimed leisure, and not labour, to be the citizen's privilege. . . . The marvel is that, *amid all this depreciation*, mechanical skill and artistic taste should have attained so high a standard" (p. 437).

Gardner and Jevons, *Manual of Greek Antiquities* (p. 379), quote Aristotle and Plato to show the extreme *popular* prejudice against handiwork and the disesteem in which it was *universally* held—"only those too poor to buy slaves had to work themselves."

Gulick, in his excellent *Life of the Ancient Athenians*, says: "The class of artisans comprised callings which among us are regarded as the most dignified professions. Wherever one of these vocations *was in disrepute*, the cause is found in the fact that the person concerned *took money for his services*, and was to that extent not independent of others. Even the great artists, painters, and sculptors fell under *public contempt* simply because they earned money. A few artists, like Phidias, are said to have enjoyed the friendship of eminent men of aristocratic birth; but most of these stories of intimacy are later exaggerations which have not taken into account the conditions of ancient industrial life. Schoolmasters, teachers of music and gymnastics, sophists and even physicians were not highly regarded" (p. 233). "To the *emporos* attached some of the *stigma of personal labor*." "Ancient communities (e.g., Athens) whose *citizens despised trade and manual labor*" (p. 65). "Art, letters, and politics, claimed the interest of the ordinary citizen far more than they do today, because it was the policy of Pericles *to render the democracy of Athens a leisure class, supported by their slaves and the revenues of the Empire*" (p. 118).

But enough of such representative quotations, they might be multiplied indefinitely. It is the aim of this paper to endeavor to correct, or, at least, to assist in the modification of this all too general conception of an essentially aristocratic Athenian society, a conception which is certainly false in some of its aspects and exaggerated or overemphasized in others.¹

¹ Attention should be called to several books which sanely discuss the topics under consideration and to which the writer is indebted: Francotte, *L'industrie dans*

Before a consideration of the subject proper it may well be asked, why is it that this view of Athenian society as aristocratic, if erroneous, is generally held? The reasons are, I believe, as follows: (1) Athens, like other Greek states, at an early period in its history, in fact, until after Solon and Cleisthenes, was, in large measure, oligarchic and aristocratic both politically and socially. Modern writers mistakenly assume that these early conditions, particularly in social life, continued. (2) Certain Greek states, e.g., Sparta, Thebes, and Crete never suffered democratization. The strictly aristocratic conditions which were permanently characteristic of these states are sometimes thought of as necessarily existing also in Athens. (3) Modern writers have the tendency implicitly to follow Plato and Aristotle as authorities and imagine that actual fifth century Athenian conditions are accurately reflected in the pages of these philosophers even when the latter are discussing theoretical politics and imaginary and ideal societies. Caution must always be observed surely in the case of these "Laconizing" theorizers who, furthermore, were intense aristocrats and distrusted democracy. (4) It is true that Athens was conservative in the granting of full and technically legal citizenship to foreigners and slaves. (5) Slavery was, of course, a recognized institution from time immemorial throughout the ancient world and Athens as well. (6) Physical *drudgery* was not relished by the Athenians. The ground is now cleared for our discussion.

I. POLITICAL CONDITIONS

Was Athens in the Age of Pericles really a political democracy? We are fortunate in having no less an authority than Pericles himself to testify for us; Pericles, the aristocrat, as reported by Thucydides,¹ the aristocrat. "Our government is *not copied*² from those of our neighbors; we are an example to them rather

la Grèce ancienne; Guirard, *La main d'œuvre industrielle dans l'ancienne Grèce*; Clerc, *Les mêtèques Athéniens*; Meyer, *Die Sklaverei im Altertum* in his *Kleine Schriften*; Ferguson, *Greek Imperialism*, chap. ii; Zimmern, *The Greek Commonwealth* (especially chaps. vii and xv). See also Croiset, *Aristophanes and the Political Parties at Athens* (trans. by Loeb); Van Hook, *Classical Journal*, XI, 495.

¹ Bk. II, *The Funeral Oration*; see Zimmern, *op. cit.*, pp. 196 ff.

² I.e., from Sparta.

than they to us. Our constitution is named a *democracy*, because it is in the hands not of the few but of *the many*. Our laws secure *equal* justice for *all* in their private disputes, and our *public opinion* welcomes and honors talent in *every branch of achievement*, not for any sectional reason, but on grounds of excellence alone. And as we give free play to *all* in our public life, so we carry the same spirit into our daily relations with one another. We are obedient to whomsoever is set in authority, and to the laws, more especially to those which offer protection to the oppressed and those unwritten ordinances whose transgression brings admitted shame. Wealth to us is not mere material for vainglory but an opportunity for achievement; and *poverty* we think is *no disgrace* to acknowledge but a real degradation to make no effort to overcome. *Our citizens attend both to public and private duties, and do not allow absorption in their own various affairs to interfere with their knowledge of the city's*. We differ from other states in regarding the man who *holds aloof from public life* not as quiet but as useless. In a word I claim that our city as a whole is an education to Greece, and that her members yield to none, man by man, for independence of spirit, many-sidedness of attainment, and complete self-reliance in limbs and brain."

In Athens, then, if not in Sparta and Plato's *Republic*, the state existed for the individual and not the individual for the state. It is unnecessary to do more than briefly to cite the facts which reveal Athens as a political democracy. *All* citizens over eighteen years of age were members of the Assembly; *all* citizens over thirty were eligible to membership in the Council of Five Hundred, the members of which were elected annually *by lot*; *all* citizens over thirty were eligible to election *by lot* to serve as jurymen in the Heliastic law courts. As Warde Fowler says: "Every citizen had the right to hold all offices, with the doubtful exception in 450, of the archonship; to serve on the Council; to take part in the Assembly; to sit as judge. There was no privileged class, no skilled politicians, no bureaucracy. The whole Athenian people were identified with, actually were the state. All shared equally in the government, education, and pleasures."¹ For this complete

¹ *The City State*, pp. 152 and 156.

political equality we may let Mr. Dickinson himself eloquently testify. Although he tells us (p. 83) that the artisan and the trader were excluded by their calling from habitual conversance with public affairs,¹ later he says (p. 112): "Among the free citizens, who included persons of every rank, no political distinction at all was drawn. All of them from the lowest to the highest had the right to speak and vote in the great assembly of the people which was the ultimate authority; all were eligible to every administrative post; all sat in turn as jurors in the law courts. The disabilities of poverty were minimized by payment for attendance in the assembly and courts. And what is more extraordinary, even distinctions of ability were levelled by the practice of filling all offices, except the highest, by lot. The citizenship was extended to every rank and calling; the poor man jostled the rich, the shopman the aristocrat, in the Assembly; cobblers, carpenters, smiths, farmers, merchants and retail dealers met together with the ancient landed gentry." "Politically the Athenian trader, and the Athenian artisan, was the equal of the aristocrat of purest blood" (p. 115).

We know that the power of the early Athenian aristocracy had been seriously curtailed by the legislation of Solon and Cleisthenes. After the Persian Wars its influence as an organized party became extremely small because of the democratic reforms of Ephialtes and Pericles through the blows dealt to the prestige of the Areopagus, the exile of Cimon, and the complete ascendancy of Pericles. There was, then, in Athens in the Age of Pericles complete political equality among the citizens; poverty, wealth, station, family, occupation, and prestige all were of no consequence.

II. SOCIAL CONDITIONS

1. *Social status of citizens in general.*—Let us now turn to an examination of the social conditions of Athenian life and scrutinize it for evidences of caste, class, snobbery, inequality, or injustice. In the city the house of the rich man and that of the poor man

¹ As a matter of fact the Assembly was largely constituted of these very elements, which indeed formed the majority; see *Plat. Prot.* 319 D, *Plat. Rep.* 8. 565 A. From *Xen. Mem.* 3. 7. 6 we learn that the Assembly was composed of fullers, cobblers, carpenters, smiths, farmers, wholesale and retail dealers.

differed little in appearance. Private unostentation as contrasted with public magnificence was the rule.¹ In fact, it was considered a breach of good taste to build and occupy a house of conspicuous cost or size. In the next place, simplicity in dress was general. Only the young (and, in particular, the Knights) dared to provoke possible derision or to invite popular prejudice by foppiness of attire or appearance. Young Mantitheus² apologizes to the Senate for his long hair and Strepsiades³ is disgusted with his son's "dandyism." Wearing the hair long might arouse suspicion of Spartan or aristocratic sympathies. An ancient witness⁴ testifies that "the Athenian people are not better clothed than the slave or alien, nor in personal appearance is there any superiority." Of course the nature of the employment might influence the quality and nature of the costume.

In all forms of social activity all the citizens participated on a parity. All could attend the theater; all joined in the public festivals and in religious sacrifices and observances. In fact, if any element in Athens was favored it was the poor and lowly. Listen to the testimony of that unregenerate old Aristocrat (just quoted) who is bitterly opposed to Democracy as an institution but admits that it really exists in Athens. He says that if you *must* have Democracy Athens is a perfect example of it, "I do not praise the Polity of the Athenians, because the very choice involves the welfare of the *baser* folk as opposed to that of the *better* class. The poorer classes and the people of Athens should have the advantage over the men of birth and wealth because it is the people who row the vessels, and put around the city her girdle of power. Everywhere greater consideration is shown to the base, to poor people, and to common folk, than to persons of good quality—this should not surprise us, this is the keystone of the preservation of the democracy. It is these poor people, this common folk, this riff-raff, whose prosperity, combined with the growth of their numbers, enhance the democracy. All the world over the cream of society is in opposition to the democracy. The objection may be raised

¹ Dem. Ol. 3. 25-26.

² Lysias 16. 18.

³ Ar. Clouds 14.

⁴ [Xen.] *Polity of the Athenians* (trans. by Dakyns), composed about 425 B.C. falsely attributed to Xenophon. Cf. Botsford and Sihler, *Hellenic Civilization*, 222 ff.

that it was a mistake to allow the universal right of speech and a seat in council; privileges which should have been reserved for the cleverest, the flower of the community. But if only the better people sat in council blessings would fall only to that class and the baser folk would get nothing. Whereas it is the other way round. The people desire to be free and to be masters and their bad legislation is the very source of the people's strength and freedom." The happy lot of the common people in ancient Athens is further described by this contemporary witness: "The rich man trains the chorus; it is the people for whom the chorus is trained. The rich man is trierarch or gymnasiarch and the people profit by their labors. The whole state sacrifices at public cost a large number of victims; the Attic Democracy keeps holiday. They build at public cost a number of palaestras, dressing-rooms, bathing establishments; the mob gets the benefit of the majority of these luxuries rather than the select few or the well-to-do. In the theater the people do not like to be caricatured in comedy; it is the wealthy or well-born or influential man who is lampooned."

Enough has been said to show that the door of opportunity was open to all in Athens at this time. Worth, ability, character, not accident of birth or position counted. The rich did not grow richer while the poor grew poorer. Surplus wealth was not at the disposal of the few. It was expended for the good of all upon religious observances, the drama, gymnasia, the navy, public buildings and their adornment, and the state support of orphans and those physically incapacitated for earning a living. The wealthier classes were expected, and, in fact, were compelled, to contribute according to their means to the common welfare through the various liturgies and taxes.

2. *The social status of the producer, artisan, etc.*—We come next to a study of the social and economic position of the workers of various kinds. As we have seen, the handbooks in general tell us that all work was regarded as degrading, every activity for which one was paid was condemned, and producers, artisans, and all workers were branded by a humiliating social stigma. No adequate proof of such a condition of affairs is forthcoming; indeed, the actual situation seems to have been otherwise in democratic

Athens of the time of Pericles. Why then is there this general mistaken notion? It is largely because of certain pronouncements in Plato and Aristotle. In the *Laws* and the *Republic* Plato insists on the gulf that should separate the citizen from the mechanic or trader. His ideal state rests upon agriculture and all the citizens are landed gentry forbidden to engage in trade. In this ideal *polis* trade and commerce are to be insignificant and the productive class is actually debarred from all political rights. A caste system is presupposed; governors and governed are sharply differentiated and each class is trained for its predestined position in the state. Aristotle, too, in his ideal state divides the population, on the one hand, into a ruling class of soldiers and judges and, on the other, into a subject class consisting of artisans and producers. As a mechanical trade renders the body and soul and intellect of free persons unfit for the exercise and practice of virtue Aristotle denies to the artisan the proper excellence of man on the ground that his occupation and status are unnatural. In an extreme Democracy the mechanic and hired laborer must needs be citizens; this is impossible in an Aristocracy in which virtue and desert constitute the sole claim to the honors of state. Other radical statements of Aristotle are that the producer only differs from a slave in being subject to all instead of to one man and that the sedentary and within-door nature of the crafts unfitted the man who exercised them for war and the chase, the most dignified employments. Physical labor is condemned by him in that it is cheapening to work for another for pay or material profit as this reduces one to the rank of a slave.¹ This would seem to be the chief source for the curious statement everywhere repeated that all Athenians who did anything for pay were condemned. That Aristotle did not represent Athenian opinion is conclusively shown by his condemnation of agriculture as preventing leisure which is at the basis of virtue. But no one doubts that agriculture was generally and highly esteemed by the Athenians. In Xenophon² in a passage which is represented as spoken by Socrates those base mechanic arts are condemned which ruin the bodies of all those engaged in them, as those who are forced to remain in sitting

¹ *Politics* 5. 1337b8.

² *Oec.* 4. 2-3.

postures and hug the gloom or crouch whole days confronting a furnace. This results in physical enervation and enfeebling of the soul and the victims have no leisure to devote to the claims of friendship and the state. Such will be sorry friends and ill-defenders of the fatherland.

It is absolutely wrong to accept these passages as conclusively proving that the Athenians regarded work as degrading and workers as social outcasts. (1) These writers do not claim to be describing actual Athenian conditions. (2) They are postulating an "ideal" society. (3) They are ever admirers of Spartan,¹ and not their own Athenian polity. (4) They were intense aristocrats in sympathy and mistrusted democracy. (5) They despised the body and its needs. (6) They had particularly in mind soul-destroying drudgery, not reasonable labor and skilled work; corrupt and petty business, not necessary and honest trade and affairs. Frequently they were contrasting the philosopher-statesmen set apart for ruling with the defective yokel. We can, indeed, if we wish, invoke the above-quoted writers in defense of work and the dignity of producing. Plato says in the *Laws*:² "Retail trade in a city is not by nature intended to do any harm, but quite the contrary; for is not he a benefactor who reduces the inequalities and incommensurabilities of goods to equality and common measure? And this is what the power of money accomplishes, and the merchant may be said to be appointed for this purpose." Plato goes on to observe that many occupations have suffered ill-repute because of the inordinate love of gain and consequent corrupt practices on the part of the unscrupulous. He concludes: "If . . . we were to compel the best men everywhere to keep taverns for a time, or carry on retail trade, or do anything of that sort; or if, in consequence of some fate or necessity, the best women were compelled

¹ Cf. Livingstone, *The Greek Genius*, etc., ch. vii. "All the political thinkers of Greece, with the exception of Plato, speak of the state as existing for the individual. Plato is not typically Greek. If Hellenism had been a persecuting religion, it would have been bound to send him to the stake. He is no admirer of freedom and is not a genuine humanist. The chief features of Plato's state are borrowed from Lycurgus with the three castes: labor, military, and governing." See Bury, *History of Greece*, II p. 148.

² xi. 918, Jowett's trans

to follow similar callings, then we should know how agreeable and pleasant all these things are; and if all such occupations were managed on incorrupt principles, they would be honored as we honor a mother or nurse." Aristotle in the *Politics* condemns agriculture as we have seen, yet elsewhere¹ he declares: "We honor the generous and brave and just. Such we conceive to be those who do not live upon others; and *such are they who live by labor* . . . chiefly agriculturists, and chief among the agriculturalists, the small farmers." Now these small farmers tilled their own fields;² in the remote districts of Attica slavery had scarcely penetrated. Xenophon³ tells the story of Eutherus, an old friend of Socrates, who, in poverty, as his property had been lost in the war, was gaining a livelihood by bodily toil. Socrates warns him that such employment in his case can be only temporary because of lack of necessary physical strength and urges him to secure a position as assistant to a large proprietor as manager of an estate. Eutherus fears the work may be servile. Socrates replies that heads of departments in a state who manage property are regarded not as performing undignified work but as having attained a higher dignity of freedom. Eutherus still demurs on the ground that he does not like to be accountable to anyone. Socrates replies that it is difficult to find work that is devoid of liability to account. It is difficult to avoid mistakes or unfriendly criticism. "Avoid captious critics," he says, "attach yourself to the considerate. Whatever you can do, do it heart and soul and make it your finest work." Another interesting and significant opinion of Socrates on this subject is reported by Xenophon⁴ which was expressed in a conversation between the philosopher and Aristarchus. The time was during the régime of the Thirty when economic and political conditions were very bad. Aristarchus' house was full of his indigent female relatives, fourteen in all. As these ladies are all expert needlewomen, skilled in the making of garments, Socrates advises his friend to put them to work; Ceramon, for example, with a few slaves, is very prosperous. Aristarchus objects to this proposal; the situations are not comparable; the members of his

¹ *Rhet.* 2. 1381a.³ *Mem.* 2. 8.² οἱ ἀβρουργοί.⁴ *Mem.* 2. 7-8.

large household are not barbarian slaves but are kinswomen and free-born. Socrates replies: "Then, on the ground that they are free-born and relatives you think they ought to do nothing but eat and sleep? Or is it your opinion that free-born people who live in this way lead happier lives and are more to be congratulated than those who devote themselves to such useful arts of life as they are skilled in? Are work and study of no value? Did your relatives learn what they know merely for useless information or as a future asset? Is the well-tempered life and a juster one attained rather through idleness or the practice of the useful? If they were called upon to do some shameful work, let them choose death rather than that; but it is otherwise. It is suitable work for women. The things which we know are those we can best perform; it is a joy to do them, and the result is fair."

Plenty of evidence is available to show that work was esteemed, not only in the times portrayed by Homer in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* and Hesiod in his *Works and Days*, but in Athens of the fifth century, B.C.¹ In Athens there was actually a law directed against idleness.² That it was long in force is shown by the fact that Lysias wrote a speech in connection with a prosecution for ἀργία³ for which the penalty on conviction was a fine of one hundred drachmas and ἀτιμία if the accused were thrice convicted. Plutarch⁴ tells us that a son who had not been taught a trade by his father was thereby released from the obligation to support his parent in old age. We have already quoted Pericles to the effect that not poverty but indolence is degrading.

Now the old-fashioned assumption that the Athenians found abundant leisure and opportunity for the *real life* (i.e., art, literature, politics, and philosophy) only because hirelings, slaves, and women did everything for them and the state treasury liberally supported them in *dolce far niente* is ridiculous.⁵ One thing is certain from all we know of the Athenians; they were not indolent; they were energetic in mind and body. Certainly in any state the

¹ See Guiraud, *op. cit.*, 37 ff.

² Attributed to Solon by Hdt. 2. 177 and Diodor. 1. 77.

³ Lysias, frag. 17 (Teub.).

⁴ Sol. 22.

⁵ Cf. Ferguson, *op. cit.*, 61 ff., to whom I am here indebted.

wealthy are but a minority of the total population and even upon these rests the duty to manage their property and care for investments. Participation in public life and fulfilment of the demands and duties of good citizenship did not exact from the average Athenian anything like the major part of his waking hours. The Assembly met four times in each prytany (or tenth of a year period), i.e., less than once a week. As the attendance was voluntary only a fraction of all who were entitled to attend were ever present, as convenience or interest dictated. The Council was limited to five hundred citizens and no one might serve more than twice; furthermore, fifty only of the Council (*οἱ πρυτάνεις*, the standing committee) were continuously on duty so that the majority thus were free to attend to their private affairs. The Heliaea, or Courts of Justice, drew their dicasts or judges for jury service from a list of six thousand citizens. These were usually men of advanced years who had volunteered for such service. Universal military service at this time was not obligatory. Festivals and contests were generally attended but they occurred probably not oftener than once a week on the average. It has been estimated that a total of from two to three years of every citizen's life were required for deliberative and administrative duties. Many writers have emphasized the huge number of citizens who were supposedly pensioners luxuriously supported, apparently permanently and completely, by largess from the Periclean treasury. We have seen that public duties were not constant. As for the compensation it must be remembered that the daily living wage for the workman was from one drachma (about 18 cents), to one and a half. Now at the time under consideration Assemblymen received no compensation; jurymen received two obols (about six cents) daily for service; members of the Council of Five Hundred, elected annually by lot, were paid five obols (about fifteen cents). In the light of these facts how can it be claimed that Pericles *corrupted* the citizens generally by gifts of money, making them idle, cowardly, and greedy¹ or to assume that these citizens were all dependent on public pay and could entirely support their households on these meager stipends. Mr. Grundy² declares:

¹ So Plat. *Gorg.* 515 E.

² *Thucydides and the History of His Age*, p. 107.

"A condition of things in which a large proportion of a community is either practically or wholly dependent on the community for subsistence is unhealthy from both a social and political viewpoint." But only a minority of the fifty to sixty thousand adult male citizens received any state pay. The remuneration given was not a living wage; it was merely a contribution to support by which Pericles provided that *all*, and not merely the well-to-do, might participate, in turn, in civic affairs and obtain that benefit and culture from active personal public service to which he eloquently refers in the Funeral Oration. Nor was the remuneration intended as a sop to placate the discontented and starving proletariat. As Ferguson¹ says: "Pericles did not intend to create a class of salaried officials; nor yet to make an advance toward communism. His ideal was political, not economic, equality—to enable all, irrespective of wealth or station, to use the opportunities and face the obligations which democracy brought in its train. Like all the great democratic leaders who preceded him, he was a nobleman by birth and breeding, and, like them, he did not doubt for a moment that the culture that enobled the life of his class would dignify and uplift that of the masses also. His aim was to unite the whole people in a community of high ideas and emotions. It was to make them a nation of noblemen." If this were not the case, Pericles' noble speech, which stands in history by the side of Lincoln's Gettysburg address, is the most hypocritical document preserved to us from the past.

Since the number of wealthy citizens was small how did the ordinary citizen gain his livelihood? It was by means of agriculture, handicrafts, trades, wholesale and retail business, and daily labor. No occupation was more respected and admired than agriculture. Farms were small, tenancy almost unknown. The small farmer tilled his fields with his own hands. In the arts and crafts and in labor no one needed to be idle for the state policies of Pericles and the great building operations not only gave employment to all the residents of Athens, whether free men or slaves, but attracted workers from far and near. Thousands of citizens, perhaps a third of the whole, gained a livelihood by labor. While

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 64.

commerce was largely in the hands of the resident-aliens, and the heaviest drudgery was performed by slaves, the mass of the skilled workers were free citizens. Stone-cutters, masons, and sculptors had their shops or yards where they worked privately with their apprentices, or they might be engaged in public work, as the building operations on the Acropolis, working side by side with other citizens, with metics, and with slaves.¹

Modest means, even poverty (certainly *paupertas*), was the rule in Athens and was no bar to achievement and distinction. Life and its needs was simple, and money in itself as an accumulation was not desired. A uniform wage was paid practically to all skilled workmen alike. Everyone who had skill or art was an artist, a term applied to sculptors, painters, physicians, and cobblers. Our handbooks generally assert that every occupation or profession which brought any financial return was despised and its practitioner was socially held in contempt. Slight reflection should show the absurdity of this thesis; there is no actual evidence to prove it. Plato, to be sure, who was wealthy and an aristocrat, sneers at those sophists and teachers who were compelled to take money for teaching. Of course there were some charlatans in this profession, but we may be certain that such sophists as Gorgias, Protagoras, Isocrates, and Alcidamas (all professors who accepted tuition from countless students who were only too glad to pay it) were held in high esteem in Athens. So were lawyers and speech-writers for pay, such as Antiphon, Lysias, and Isaeus. Literary men who accepted pay, poets who received purses for prizes, and actors who profited financially by their labors stood in the highest social esteem. The prestige of physicians depended on their skill and personality. The ignoramus and the charlatan were contemned; the skilled and public-spirited surgeon might be richly rewarded and given an honorary crown and public thanks.² The elementary-school teacher, the music and gymnastic instructor, were not highly regarded, not because they received money for their services, but because most of them were ignorant men and often of inferior breeding. As for the great artists, sculptors, and

¹ Cf. Zimmern, *Greek Commonwealth*, chap. vii.

² See Hermann, *Lehrb. d. Griech. Privataltertümer*, pp. 351 ff.; cf. Michel, *Rec.*, 120.

painters it is simply impossible to believe such a statement as this: "Even the great artists, painters, and sculptors fell under public contempt simply because they earned money."¹ Could this be true of a Phidias, a Polygnotus, an Ictinus, or a Mnesicles? But we know that Phidias was a warm and extremely intimate personal friend of Pericles.² In fact, the statesmen admired the sculptor so highly that the latter was entrusted with the greatest powers in superintending the ornamentation of the great temples. As for Polygnotus, a native of Thasos, he was the personal friend of Cimon,³ and was actually honored by the Athenians with citizenship. Expert potters and vase-painters were very numerous. While some of these were resident aliens (e.g. Amasis and Brygos), very many were citizens. Thus we find such names of prominent vase-makers as Klitias, Ergotimos, Nikosthenes, Epiktetes, Pamphaios, Euphronios, Hieron, and Megakles. A typical vase-making establishment would engage the services of some twelve persons who might be citizens, metics, and slaves all working side by side in equality.⁴ Citizen artists and artisans proclaim with pride, and do not conceal in shame, their occupations. Vase-painters and makers signed their wares. A scene (The Workshop of a Greek Vase-Painter) on a vase⁵ shows two Victories and Athena herself crowning the workmen, as Pottier says: "a poetic symbol to glorify the fame of Athenian industry." Indeed, artisans regarded themselves as under the special protection of Hephaestus, the smith, and of Athena, mistress of the arts and crafts, and were proud to claim descent from these deities.⁶ The potter, Euphronios, when making an offering to Athena calls himself in his dedication, *κεραμεύς*,⁷ and the same procedure is followed by the fuller Simon, the tanner Smikros, and the potters, Mnesiades and Nearchus.⁸ On a funereal bas-relief a cobbler was represented in a heroic attitude holding the insignia of his trade.⁹ In the neighborhood of the Agora shops were especially numerous. These places served

¹ Gulick, *op. cit.*, p. 234.

² Plut. *Per.* 13. 9.

³ Plut. *Cim.* 4.

⁴ Cf. Pottier, *Douris and the Painters of Greek Vases*.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Fig. 2.

⁷ *CIA*, IV, 1, p. 79, no. 362.

⁶ Plato *Laws* 11. 920 D.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 42, 88, 101, 103.

⁹ Conze, *Attische Grabreliefs*, T. I, Pl. 119.

as centers of gossip and of news for Athenians generally, as we are told in a graphic passage in an informative speech of Lysias.¹ It was among these craftsmen that Socrates, who had himself started in life as a stonecutter, spent much time in conversation. When he was, on an occasion, in search of a gentleman, he did not hesitate to go the round of various good carpenters, bronzeworkers, painters, and sculptors.

The comedies of Aristophanes are sometimes taken as proof of great social distinctions and inequalities existing among the citizens of Athens. Thus Mr. Dickinson,² in an endeavor to maintain his thesis that Athens was politically democratic but socially intensely aristocratic, quotes at length the passage from the comedy of the *Knights* where the sausage-seller is assured that his crass ignorance, boorish vulgarity, and dense stupidity are the strongest possible recommendations and assets for the highest political distinction. We are apparently to infer that Aristophanes was himself a deep-dyed aristocrat who despised the people and their rule and that he was the spokesman for a large aristocratic section of Athenian society who were extremely hostile to democratic government. These views are unwarranted and, indeed, have been wholly discredited.³ Aristophanes was not a partisan; he was a conservative. He was not an opponent of democracy nor yet an aristocrat. It is true that he was a well-educated man of keen discernment, a friend of the *Knights*, and was doubtless on good terms with members of the aristocratic element in Athens. But he was friendly to the cause of democracy and sincerely wished to do it a favor by fearlessly revealing those defects to which a democratic form of

¹ *On the Cripple* (No. 24), 19-20: "My accuser says that many unprincipled men gather at my shop. But you (the large jury) all know that this accusation is not directed at me more than other artisans, nor at those who frequent my place more than those who go to other shops. Each of you is accustomed to visit the establishment of the perfumer, or the barber, or the leatherworker, etc. If any of you shall condemn my visitors then he must condemn the frequenters of other places; and if these, then *all the Athenians*. Certainly *all* of you are accustomed to frequent these shops and spend time somewhere or other."

² Page 113: "We may quote a passage from Aristophanes which shows at once the influence exercised by the trading class and the disgust with which that influence was regarded by the aristocracy whom the poet represents."

³ See Croiset, *Aristophanes and the Political Parties at Athens*, trans. by Loeb.

government is especially liable and to give warning of possible dangers. This he constantly does in his plays with that exaggeration and caricature which are characteristic of the Old Comedy. In the opinion of the poet grave danger to the democracy might arise from unscrupulous demagoguery as represented by such knaves as Cleon. In the case of Cleon, who is lampooned in the play of the *Knights*, Aristophanes is actuated by intense animus as a result of previous personal encounters. Thus Cleon is excoriated as a vulgar, coarse, and despicable individual, and the dramatist tries to discredit his influence and popularity. It is a great mistake to take Aristophanes' savage attacks on vulgar demagogues and criticisms of weaknesses in democratic government as proof that Aristophanes was an aristocrat who condemned and arraigned the people as a whole for vulgarity and incompetency. That he did not despair of the democracy and that he sympathized and fraternized with the "lower classes" is shown by those plays in which the chief personages, although of low degree, are "sympathetic characters," e.g., Dicaeopolis, the charcoal-burner of the *Acharnians* and Strepsiades, the rough countryman of the *Clouds*.

In the opinion of Croiset, "the best Athenian society was the most open-hearted, most variously constituted, and most liberal society that has ever existed. The Athens that Plato shows us is a sort of talking place, where everybody is supposed to know everybody else, and where each person has a perfect right to make acquaintance with those he meets."¹ As typical illustrations of this social democracy he refers to two social gatherings of which we have admirable accounts. In Xenophon's *Symposium* we have a description of a banquet held in 421 B.C., in the house of the wealthy Callias, son of Hipponicus, of a great and rich Athenian family. The guests include all sorts of people, rich, poor, philosophers and ignoramuses, and all converse familiarly on terms of equality and intimacy. In the same way, Plato, in his *Symposium*, an account of a dinner held at the house of Agathon in 416 B.C., reveals the same intermixture of classes and professions.

3. *The status of the metics.*—We have now completed our discussion of the essentially democratic political and social status

¹ Croiset, *op. cit.*, p. 12.

of Athenian citizens. It remains to consider briefly the other two classes of the inhabitants of Attica who are commonly regarded, along with the poorer citizens, as the exploited victims of the Athenian aristocracy. These elements are the metics (resident aliens) and the slaves.

The rapid commercial growth and naval expansion of Athens early caused a shortage of workers and helpers of all kinds. The citizen population was numerically inadequate to assume these new duties in addition to the performance of their regular occupations and the prosecution of agriculture. This demand was met by extending a welcome to foreigners and this policy was continued and encouraged by Pericles. Their exact number in the year 431 B.C. is unknown. Meyer's¹ estimate is adult male metics 14,000 to about 55,000 adult male citizens; Clerc² estimates them at 24,000, followed by Zimmern;³ Ferguson⁴ gives the number of adult male citizens as 50,000, and a total population of Attica of 300,000 of which one-sixth was foreign and one-third servile. There may have been, then, one adult male metic for every two citizens.

What was the lot of the metics? It has been asserted that their social position was humiliating and that they were disliked and even despised by the ordinary citizen.⁵ But contemporary evidence does not indicate this. Pericles says: "We open our city to all and never drive out foreigners." The scene of Plato's dialogue, *The Republic*, is the house of Cephalus, a prominent and influential man, but a metic who had been invited to Attica by Pericles himself. Another contemporary⁶ speaks of "the equality between the metics and the full citizens, because the city stands in need of her resident aliens to meet the requirements of such a multiplicity of arts and for the purposes of her navy." Thucydides has Nicias say to metic sailors that they and not any friends or allies outside were the "only free partners with the Athenians in the Empire."⁷ The metics participated fully in the social and reli-

¹ *Kleine Studien*, p. 129.

³ P. 409.

² *Les mêtèques Athéniens*, p. 373.

⁴ P. 42.

⁵ Gulick, p. 65, and Headlam, *J.H.S.* (1906), p. 273.

⁶ [Xen.] *Pol. of the Athenians*, I, 12.

⁷ 7. 63. 3-4.

gious life of the city. Neither in dress nor appearance could they be distinguished from the citizens. They attended the theater,¹ they had a prominent place and dress in the Panathenaic procession,² they were demesmen and worshipped the same deities as the citizens.³ Like the citizens they defrayed the expenses of the liturgies and served in the army and the navy. When any list of Athenian inhabitants is given the metics are always named as an essential element of the population.⁴ They worked in large numbers side by side and for equal pay with the citizens in all kinds of work⁵ as, for example, the construction of the Erechtheum.⁶ They are found engaged in all the occupations, as workers and artisans of all kinds, as merchants at Peiraeus and at Athens, as bankers and capitalists, as painters, sculptors, and artists, as architects, and as philosophers and orators. Many of the famous pupils of Isocrates were metics, and no less than three of the celebrated Canon of the Ten Orators were resident aliens, namely, Isaeus of Chalcis, Lysias of Syracuse, and Deinarchus of Corinth.

The fee of twelve drachmas (about \$2.16) required of metics was a petty matter, a legal formality of registration and license and not an onerous tax burden, as it is often regarded. The liability to taxes beyond those required of citizens was not great. Perhaps the most serious limitation imposed upon aliens was the inability legally to own real property. But metics might be placed on equal terms as to taxation and the owning of property with the citizens thereby becoming *ισοτελεῖς*, and full citizenship might be conferred by vote of the Assembly. For example, an inscription⁷ is preserved which records the grant of full citizenship on those metics who participated in the return of the democrats from Phyle (in 404-3) and helped in the restoration. In the list occur some strangely sounding foreign names, e.g. *Βενδιφάνης* and *Ψαμμίς*, and their occupations as given are decidedly humble, such as cook, gardener, carpenter, fuller, etc.

The Athenians have been harshly criticized for not freely and generally granting citizenship to the metics. At first thought the

¹ Haigh, *Attic Theater*, pp. 364 and 376.

⁴ See Guiraud, *op. cit.*, pp. 152 ff.

² Harpoc. and Suidas, s.v. *Σκαφηφόροι*.

⁵ See Clerc, *Les mêtèques Athéniens*.

³ Cf. Wilamowitz, *Hermes*, vol. 22.

⁶ *CIA*, I, 324.

⁷ Hicks-Hill, *Greek Historical Inscriptions*, 161 ff.

criticism may seem valid and Athens illiberal. But the citizenship to the Athenian was not merely a political privilege; it was a sacred and usually an *inherited* possession. Loss of citizenship was to be feared more than death itself. Athens was a small and homogeneous community and the Athenians regarded themselves as autochthonous, like their favorite and symbolic cicada, sprung from the very soil of Attica itself. There is danger to a state in a too rapid influx of aliens who are given the powers of citizenship before real political and social assimilation has taken place. Even free America requires a term of years of probation before naturalization, and one of our greatest problems surely is this very one of the assimilation of the large number of our resident aliens. As Aristotle¹ says: "Another cause for revolution is difference of races which do not acquire a common spirit; for the state is not the growth of a day, neither is it a multitude brought together by accident. Hence the reception of strangers in colonies has generally produced revolution." It is true that the metics of Athens were not on full terms of political equality with the citizens but it has been shown that the yawning social and economic gulf postulated by modern writers between citizen and resident foreigner did not really exist.

4. *The status of the slaves.*—The institution of slavery existed throughout the ancient world from the earliest times. The Athenians, with but few exceptions, regarded slavery as natural and justifiable. It is again Aristotle, the fourth-century theorist and philosopher, who is made the starting-point for most modern discussions of slavery among the Greeks and the iniquity of the institution as maintained even by the cultured Athenians of the time of Pericles. In his treatment of this subject Aristotle² characterizes in a cold-blooded legal fashion the slave as being merely "a breathing machine or tool, a piece of animated property" (*ἐμψυχον ὄργανον, κτῆμά τι ἐμψυχον*) and asserts that some men are so inferior that they may be regarded as slaves by nature. It is interesting to note, however, that Aristotle in another passage³ admits that there were some who protested against such a view. He says: "Others regard slave owning as doing violence to nature

¹ *Politics* 1303a.

² *Politics* 1253b; *Eth. Nic.* 1161b.

³ *Politics* 1253b.

on the ground that the distinction of slave and free man is wholly conventional and has no place in nature, and therefore is void of justice, as resting on mere force." Pláto,¹ too, regards slavery as natural and justifiable but would forbid the enslavement of Greeks;² he admits, however, that "a slave is an embarrassing possession, the distinction between man and slave being a difficult one and slaves should be well-treated and not abused or insulted."³ Aristotle, also, advises good treatment for the slave.⁴

Recent writers have been very severe in their strictures on the Athenians for tolerating slavery. Professor Mahaffy⁵ writes: "Our real superiority lies in our moral ideals, in our philanthropy, our care of the poor and the sick."⁶ I do not know whether the existence and justification of slavery as a natural institution are not the main cause of this difference. Xenophon tells us of the callous and brutal attitude to slaves and prisoners. If it was true then it must have been true ten times more in the colder, harsher, and more selfish society of the preceding generation. The milk of human kindness seems to have run dry among them. . . . The association of the good with the beautiful and the true seems incomplete. The latter two are attained in no ordinary degree. The former, which is to us the most divine of the three, was but poorly represented." Mr. Dickinson⁷ goes so far as to say that Athenian slaves had *no political and social rights at all*. It is true that a minority of the slaves in Attica must have had an unenviable existence. These were the men who, in large numbers, slaved in the silver mines at Laurium. But what was the lot of the majority of the slaves in Attica? A contemporary⁸ testifies: "An extraordinary amount of license is granted to slaves . . . where a blow is illegal, and a slave will not step aside to let you pass him on the street. . . . The Athenian people is not better clothed

¹ *Rep.* 5. 469.

² *Laws* 777b.

³ *Rep.* 563b.

⁴ *Politics* 1255b.

⁵ *A Survey of Greek Civilization*, p. 150. But see Gulick, *Humanity among the Greeks in Harvard Essays on Classical Subjects*.

⁶ Charity on a scientific basis, to be sure, is a modern institution, but we should not forget that Athens supported at public expense war-orphanes (cf. Thuc. *Per. Funeral Speech*), also gave aid to the poor who were physically incapacitated for work (See Lysias, *On the Cripple*) and maintained public physicians. (See Boeckh, *Staatsh.*, I, 308 ff.)

⁷ *P.* 76.

⁸ [Xen.] *Pol. of the Athenians*, I, 10-12.

than the slave or alien, nor in personal appearance is there any superiority. . . . Slaves in Athens are allowed to indulge in luxury, and indeed in some cases to live magnificently.¹ . . . We have established an equality between our slaves and free men." Newly acquired slaves were received into the household with showers (καταχύσματα²) of confections. They participated as members of the family in religious rites and sacrifices.³ They might attend the theater.⁴ They worked side by side with their masters in the workshop or might even be permitted to work on their own account exercising an independent profession (χωρὶς οἰκοῦντες) either paying a commission to their masters or actually purchasing their freedom and gaining thereby the status of metics. The law protected a slave from being the victim of ὕβρις and the aggressor was subject to fine. The slave might not be put to death; a free man who had killed a slave was subject to prosecution for manslaughter. Refuge from a cruel master was afforded by flight to a temple as sanctuary,⁵ namely, to the Theseum, the Sanctuary of the Erinyes, and the altar of Athena Polias. Freedom might be granted outright by the master, while the state at times enfranchised slaves who had fought for Athens.⁶ In case of illness a slave might be affectionately cared for and at death mourned as a relative.⁷

It is certainly a false assertion to claim that Athenian society rested on slavery and that slavery was the dominant factor in Athenian economic life. The slaves were in the minority⁸ in the total population at this period and the prosperity and greatness of the state was due to the industry, the initiative, and the efficiency of citizen and metic. Mr. Grundy⁹ says that "the ultimate controlling fact in Greek politics of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. is the evil economic condition of the lower classes due to the competition of slave labour as competition with slave labour was impossible for the free proletariat." But this was not the case in the

¹ Cf. Aesch. 1. 54.

² See Suidas, s.v. and Sch. to Ar. *Plut.* 768.

³ Aesch. *Agam.* 1037, χειρίβιον κοινωριό.

⁴ Haigh, *Athic Theater*, pp. 364, 368.

⁵ See Ferguson, *op. cit.*, p. 42, and Whibley, *Comp. to Greek Studies*, § 541.

⁶ *Thucydides and the History of His Age*, p. 106.

⁵ Michel, *Rec.*, 557.

⁶ Xen. *Mem.* 2. 4. 3.

⁷ For example, Arginusae.

fifth century. There was no unemployment in Athens in the Age of Pericles. As we have seen the demand for labor was so great that extensive immigration was encouraged and there was a living wage for all. It is undoubtedly true, however, that in the fourth century and later the competition of slave with free labor gave rise to economic distress at a time when the citizens had decreased in number but the slaves had enormously increased. Mr. Grundy further declares that all hand-labor became associated with slavery and hence became incompatible with the dignity of the free man. The absolute falsity of this conception has already been established.

CONCLUSION

As a result of this study the following conclusions may be made:

1. Perhaps the greatest error and most unscientific procedure of many writers is to disregard or underestimate local conditions and, in particular, the chronological factor. Far too often authors indulge in generalizations regarding "the ancient Greek." It is no more possible to make general sweeping statements correctly characterizing the institutions of "the ancient Greek" than it would be accurately to estimate the civilization of "the modern European." Sparta and Athens were as far apart politically and socially in numerous respects as Germany and America, while Athens of the second half of the fifth century B.C. in its political, social, and economic conditions was by no means the Athens of the sixth or fourth centuries.

2. The ideal, aristocratic conceptions of Plato and Aristotle must not, and cannot be taken literally to reflect actual Athenian conditions. Certainly Aristotle should not be taken as having "an average Greek mind" in his attitude toward society¹ nor is he, or Plato, representative of fifth-century popular belief.²

3. The time-honored tradition that Athenians despised all work and looked down upon all workers is false and our handbooks

¹ As might be inferred from Mr. Dickinson, p. 76.

² Cf. Guiraud, *Etudes économiques sur l'antiquité*, p. 52: "Les philosophes avaient beau alléguer que le citoyen, pour être vraiment à la hauteur de ses obligations, doit être comme à Sparte, un homme de loisir, et que, s'il ne peut pas vivre entièrement du travail d'autrui, il doit tout au moins s'interdire les professions manuelles, qui ont le double inconvénient de dégrader le corps et l'âme; cette opinion était en désaccord avec le sentiment public et la législation des démocraties."

need revision in their treatment of this topic.¹ It is true that in Athens, as with us, some occupations were thought less desirable and less dignified than others. In no land and at no time is the day laborer esteemed as highly as the statesman. Drudgery and menial employment the Athenians disliked and avoided; so do we. But the citizen who earned his living in some honest way and accepted money for his services was the rule and not the exception, nor was he as a result a social outcast but was a member, in good political and social standing, of the commonwealth.²

4. The disabilities of the metics are generally exaggerated. Their position in Athenian society was not humiliating. While the resident aliens did not have full participation in political duties and privileges they did share, in a remarkable measure, the life of the citizens.

5. Slavery was, of course, an Athenian institution, and the right of owning slaves was, in general, not questioned. It is clear, however, that as a rule they were treated by their masters with humaneness and consideration, with the exception of the lowest class of public slaves who were employed in the mines.

6. It would be absurd to claim perfection for the Athenian democracy of the Age of Pericles, or to pretend that the Athenians had completely and happily solved the innumerable and complicated social, political, and economic problems which still vex the world and which still await solution even today. Athens was not, of course, at any time a perfect democracy. But that it was far more democratic and far less aristocratic in the time of Pericles than is generally assumed and asserted is certain.

¹ Tucker, *Life in Ancient Athens*, is, in some respects, an exception.

² Guiraud, *ibid.*, p. 53: "Nul n'y rougissait de son métier, a moins qu'il ne fût notoirement sordide ou immoral."

LATIN EXAMINATIONS AS TESTS OF INTELLIGENCE¹

BY NELSON G. MCCREA
Columbia University

Among the romances of my early reading that linger pleasantly in my memory is Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe's *Oldtown Folks*. It is a simple yet vivacious description of life in New England as the eighteenth century gave place to the nineteenth, and it appealed to my imagination then, as in certain moods it does still, through its pictures of the part that religion, or rather, perhaps, theology, played in the daily life and thought of those times. One of the most engaging figures is a certain Jonathan Rossiter, the head of an academy at which the four young people of the story are educated. Nearly one hundred pages are devoted to the experiences of the years that they spend under his instruction, but a single quotation may serve to suggest the intellectual atmosphere of their school world.

He scorned all conventional rules in teaching, and he would not tolerate a mechanical lesson, and took delight in puzzling his pupils and breaking up all routine business by startling and unexpected questions and assertions. He compelled everyone to think, and to think for himself. "Your heads may not be the best in the world," was one of his sharp off-hand sayings, "but they are the best God has given you and you must use them for yourselves."

To tell the truth, he used his teaching somewhat as a mental gratification for himself. If there was a subject he wanted to investigate, or an old Greek or Latin author that he wanted to dig out, he would put a class on it, without the least regard to whether it was in the course of college preparation or not, and if a word was said by any poor mechanical body, he would blast out upon him with a sort of despotic scorn. "Learn to read Greek perfectly," he said, "and it's no matter what you read"; or, "learn to use your own heads, and you can learn anything."²

We read presently that it was a matter of pride with Mr. Rossiter that his boys should go to Cambridge more than ready, and we are

¹ A paper read at the fourteenth annual meeting of the Classical Association of New England, at Wheaton College, Norton, Mass., March 29, 1919.

² Stowe, *Oldtown Folks*, chap. xxxiii.

not surprised. His whole training aimed at the development of alert intelligence and individual initiative in the use of it.

However modest we may be, the present war has given us just ground for pride in the intelligence of the American soldier. His resourcefulness has been much in evidence. And certainly never before has the science of psychology been so utilized to ascertain the fact and the degree of the presence of intelligence with a view to securing by proper assignment to duty the greatest military efficiency. The tests¹ used in the Army were prepared by a committee of the American Psychological Association and of the National Research Council, and up to November 1, 1918, approximately 1,500,000 men had been tested. Professor E. L. Thorndike has given us recently² a very interesting account of some of the results of these tests. He raises the question: "If for the sake of war we can measure roughly the intelligence of a third of a million soldiers a month, and find it profitable to do so, can we not each year measure the intelligence of every child coming ten years of age and will not that be still more profitable?"

It is important to note at this point that the tests used in the Army were intended to measure one thing only, namely, intelligence.

The rating a man earns furnishes a fairly reliable index of his ability to learn, to think quickly and accurately, to analyze a situation, to maintain a state of mental alertness, and to comprehend and follow instructions. The score is little influenced by schooling. Some of the highest records have been made by men who had not completed the eighth grade.³

"The score," it is officially claimed, "is little influenced by schooling." It would however, I should think, be discouraging to feel that study in school or in college dulled the edge of this native intelligence. It would, in fact, seem to be quite unfortunate if any subject in the curriculum should be so taught as not to call into play for the quicker mastery of its problems this general responsiveness to the facts of life. We Latinists certainly must hold with Matthew Arnold⁴ that Montesquieu was right in saying

¹ *Army Mental Tests* (Nov. 22, 1918). Office of the Surgeon General, Washington, D.C.

² "Scientific Personnel Work in the Army," *Science*, XLIX (Jan. 17, 1919), 53-61.

³ *Army Mental Tests*, p. 5.

⁴ *Culture and Anarchy*, chap. i, p. 6.

that "the first motive which ought to impel us to study is the desire to augment the excellence of our nature and to render an intelligent being yet more intelligent." We must agree with Professor Barrett Wendell when, in an article¹ justifying by purely practical considerations the old system of classics and mathematics in comparison with anything newer, he says:

Education is a matter partly of information and partly of training. The latter phase of it seems to me the more important. A satisfactorily educated man distinguishes himself from an uneducated one chiefly because for general purposes his faculties are better under his control. An educated man, in short, when confronted with new or unexpected problems, can generally use his wits better than an uneducated one. Here we are on purely practical ground.

If, then, the study of Latin actually furthers the use of one's wits, actually renders a pupil more resourceful when confronted by a problem within the general range of his physical and mental experience, one may reasonably expect to find satisfactory evidence of this throughout the years of the Latin course, and in particular in the examinations in which he has opportunity to use alike his information and his training. Please do not think that these remarks portend a jeremiad. "Are we down-hearted? No!" I need only present to you an analysis of statistics given on pages 20 and 21 of Professor Fiske's Report covering the examinations of June, 1918. The ordinary examinations in seventeen different subjects were taken by 9,889 candidates with the following result for the first eight places:

Subject	Number of Candidates	60-100 Per Cent
1. Greek.....	698	67.5
2. Mathematics.....	11,646	62.9
3. Latin.....	8,314	59.9
4. Botany.....	58	58.6
5. French.....	4,664	58.0
6. Physics.....	1,829	52.9
7. Chemistry.....	992	52.2
8. Zoölogy.....	14	50.0

In these seventeen subjects the Board held fifty separate examinations, e.g., Mathematics A2, Latin 3, French A. If we consider

¹ "Our National Superstition," *North American Review*, CLXXIX (1904), 388-401.

examinations that were taken by at least ninety-nine candidates (one per cent of the total number), we shall find that in twenty-two of the fifty more than one-half of the candidates secured 60 per cent or higher. If we arrange these twenty-two separate examinations in the order of their superiority, as Professor C. H. Forbes did at the close of his admirable paper on "The Sham Argument against Latin," we shall note with satisfaction the following result: Greek BG, Greek CH, Mathematics A2, Mathematics A, Latin 3, Mathematics B, Latin 4, Latin 5, French A, Latin 6, Mathematics D, Greek A2, Latin 2, Mathematics F, Mathematics C, Latin 1, 2, 4, English 1, French B, Physics, Chemistry, Greek A1, German A. In other words, out of the first five places Greek has two, Mathematics two, Latin one; out of the first ten places, Latin has four, Mathematics three, Greek two, French one; out of the first fifteen places, Mathematics has six, Latin five, Greek three, French one. Only one of the Latin examinations taken by any considerable number of candidates failed to secure a place among these eighteen, viz., Latin 1, Grammar, in which, alas, only 43.9 per cent out of 1,024 candidates secured 60 per cent or higher. We may, however, console ourselves by the fact that Latin 3, Second-Year Latin, involving translation at sight only, with relevant questions on grammar and composition, stood fifth in the entire list of fifty examinations and only 28.9 per cent of 1,901 candidates failed to secure 60 per cent or higher. It is, then, beyond cavil that, so far as the statistics of the Board for 1918, covering the performance of nearly 10,000 individual pupils, throw light upon the results of secondary education, Mathematics, Latin, and Greek are easily the best taught subjects in the United States. Let us present our respectful compliments to Dr. Abraham Flexner.

Can we do better? I think we can and should. We can and should in the translation of every Latin sentence in the classroom throughout the entire course call into play as our most potent helper that general intelligence, that mother-wit, the possession and use of which distinguishes a human being from a parrot. With mother-wit on the alert, *ex pede Herculem* becomes possible; without mother-wit, even a very fair amount of information about syntax may lead to an incorrect translation. A knowledge of

vocabulary is in general absolutely indispensable, but even here intelligence can in not a few cases make good a temporary deficiency, not by any haphazard guess, but through the logical compulsion of the words that are known. Why should we fear to train as at least a by-product of our work something that is akin to the scientific imagination? Some scientists claim that "the development and discipline of the imagination is the best gift of science to our intellectual life, and hence to liberal education."¹

Let me make my meaning clear by a few sentences taken from First-Year Latin Books, with some *variae lectiones* of my own. I shall assume an intelligent pupil who knows the meanings of the Latin words, who has a decent knowledge of the forms and their simple meanings as given with the paradigms, but whose acquaintance with case and mood constructions is extremely limited. With this relatively slender equipment he relies as much as possible upon his mother-wit; but, having come to regard his teacher as a sensible person, he obeys the three commandments that have been declared to be necessary to salvation: (1) Rely upon the order of the Latin words as a sure clue to the meaning of the sentence; (2) Never identify a Latin word with one single English word. Words are at best only symbols. The English rendering² should vary according to the context. (3) Distrust every apparent meaning of a sentence which does not agree with ordinary common sense.

Listen to such a pupil as he comments on some Latin sentences. *Aquam nautae amant.* Only one meaning possible. *Vitam nautae amant:* "Sailors love life." Perhaps; but so do other people. Why then say so? "They love a sailor's life." Much more sensible, and therefore more likely. But I can not be sure until I know what circumstances called forth the remark. *Decem annis Caesar multa bella gessit:* "For (during) ten years Caesar waged many wars." Possibly, but he must have had his hands full in

¹ See Professor E. B. Wilson's noble address, "Science and Liberal Education," *Science*, XLII (Nov. 5, 1915), 625-30.

² See H. C. Nutting, "The Translation of Latin," *Classical Journal*, V (1910), 165-70. Professor Nutting gives an interesting list of fifteen different renderings of *magnus*.

fighting many different foes at once. "In (within) ten years Caesar waged many wars." Much more sensible, and therefore more likely. *Decem annis Caesar duo milia hominum interfecit.* Only one meaning possible, viz., "In (within) ten years" *Urbem defensoribus vacuam reppererunt.* Let us suppose for a moment that he ignores the forms almost absolutely. He writes down the English equivalents of the Latin words in their order: "city defenders empty have found." Do these words mean "The defenders found the city empty"? Unlikely. One would expect the assailants, not the defenders, to find the city empty. "The city found the defenders empty"? Nonsense! Intelligence is thus forced to a correct translation with almost no help from the forms. *Avari milites aras spoliaverunt donis:* "Greedy soldiers altars have despoiled gifts." Every combination nonsensical except one. Again a correct translation with almost no help from forms. *Ipsius Sullae domum deleverunt, filios et uxorem fuga salutem petere coegerunt:* "Himself Sulla home they destroyed, sons and wife flight safety to seek they compelled." One bit of syntax is here requisite, viz., the case of home, for it might be *at home*. This determined, every combination, as before, is nonsensical save the right one. *Omnibus rebus ad profectionem comparatis diem constituunt qua die ad ripam Rhodani omnes conveniant:* "all things to (for) departure procured day they fix which day to bank Rhone all they assembled." As *comparatis* obviously goes with *rebus*, this collocation leads to an inevitable result except for one momentary doubt. Do they all *actually* assemble? Then why not Indicative Mood? Ah! one naturally fixes a day for a meeting, a day on which to meet. "They fixed, then, a day on which they are all to assemble at the bank of the Rhone." Quite sensible!

Consider now parts of two sentences from the passage set last June for translation at sight on Latin 5.

. . . . fluctibus actos
atra subegit hiems vestris succedere terris

"waves driven black has forced winter (storm) your to approach lands." Evidently X (identity not yet clear) "has forced" Y (identity not yet clear) "to approach your land." What next?

What further slight acquaintance with grammar will yet suffice? Simply this, that *actos* is accusative plural, while *fluctibus* is not, *subegit* is singular, and *atra* and *hiems* are both nominative. Only one translation is now reasonable.

Sive fide seu quis bello est expertus et armis

"Whether good faith or anyone war has tested and arms."
 "Whether . . . or" gives a choice between two different things.
 "Good faith" then is clearly different from "war and arms," and must express some friendly relation. The words then yield apparently perfectly good sense: "Whether anyone has tested good faith or war and arms." But the nouns because of their forms cannot be the objects of the verb, and one commonly makes a test "by" some means or "in" some way. The object of the verb must now be sought in the main clause, and is clearly the idea expressed in the preceding verse in the words *dextram potentem*. Our pupil, however, will perhaps be content with the following translation: "Whether anyone has made a test in friendship or in war and arms." The correct translation is thus forced with only slight help from syntax; yet both these sentences, especially the second, caused great difficulty last June to fourth-year candidates.

Latin abounds in whole sentences or whole clauses whose meaning can be determined by the exercise of intelligence in the manner that I have roughly sketched. Shall we, then, eliminate the study of syntax? *Di meliora duint!* But it is certainly tragic if information about syntax, instead of helping intelligence to operate more swiftly and more confidently actually confuses it, or even tends to its disuse. A fully inflected language like Latin provides constant guide-posts to the meaning that are lacking in a comparatively uninflected language like English. I beg your consideration of a number of English passages for whose meaning the reader is forced to rely wholly upon mother-wit. With the exception of some from Milton's *Paradise Lost* these passages are all taken from books in the lists upon which the Board's entrance examinations in English are based. On the paper in English 2—Literature, for last June you will find a passage of seventeen verses from Book I of *Paradise Lost* which opens as follows:

. . . Darkened so, yet shone
Above them all the Archangel: but his face
Deep scars of thunder had intrenched, and care
Sat on his faded cheek . . .

Is "face" the subject or the object of "had intrenched"? There are only two possibilities, and there is for an intelligent pupil only one sensible answer. If such a pupil should read further in Book I he would of course find no difficulty in

Him the Almighty Power
Hurled headlong flaming from the ethereal sky.

English here gives at the outset the help of inflection that is characteristic of Latin. But presently he would meet

There the companions of his fall, o'erwhelmed
With floods and whirlwinds of tempestuous fire,
He soon discerns.

Until our pupil reaches the third verse, he cannot be sure of the construction of "companions," for clearly Milton might have written "Him soon discerned."

That glory never shall his wrath or might
Extort from me.

The roof was fretted gold. Not Babilon
Nor great Alcairo such magnificence
Equalled in all their glories.

The context makes the meaning clear in much the same way as it does for the verse

nec Troiam Ausonios gremio excepisse pigebit.

In spite of the logic of the facts, aided by the caption of the sight passage, this verse troubled the candidates in Vergil last June.

. . . ; or faery elves,
Whose midnight revels, by a forest-side
Or fountain, some belated peasant sees.

In the last passage the verb "sees," when it comes, makes the connection between "revels" and "peasant" perfectly clear. If, instead of "sees," Milton had written "charm" or "fright," the relation between the two nouns would have been reversed, but this

relation would have been understood with equal ease from the nature of the ideas alone.

But let us now turn to the books in the English list:

"It is the last time—'tis the last,"
He muttered thrice,—“the last time e'er
That angel voice shall Roderick hear.”¹

Write “cheer” for “hear” and note the result of the change.

From Chillon's snow-white battlement
Which round about the wave inthrals.²

But change “wave” to “doomed” or “lost.”

Hands, that the rod of Empire might have swayed.³

But Gray could have said, “Hearts, that the joys of Empire might have swayed.” Note now a few verses that might cause a moment's, but only a moment's, hesitation.

Now in the Castle-park drew out
Their chequered bands the joyous rout.⁴

Gently he dried the falling tear
And gently whispered hope and cheer.
Her faltering steps, half led, half staid,
Through gallery fair and high arcade
Till at his touch, its wings of pride
A portal arch unfolded wide.⁵

A blither heart, till Ellen came,
Did never love nor sorrow tame.⁶

And all the air a solemn stillness holds.⁷

Whose turf, whose shade, whose flowers among
Wanders the hoary Thames along
His silver-winding way.⁸

¹ *The Lady of the Lake*, III, 30.

² *The Prisoner of Chillon*.

³ *Elegy Written in a Country Churchyard*.

⁷ *Elegy Written in a Country Churchyard*.

⁸ *On a Distant Prospect of Eton College*.

⁴ *The Lady of the Lake*, V, 22.

⁵ *Ibid.*, VI, 25.

⁶ *Ibid.*, II, 25.

Prancing in pride of earthly trust,
His charger hurled him to the dust,
And, by a base plebeian thrust,
He died his band before.¹

While the cock, with lively din,
Scatters the rear of darkness thin,
And to the stack, or the barn-door,
Stoutly struts his dames before.²

Observe that in the last three passages the prepositions "among" and "before" follow the nouns that they govern. Why in the sight passage on Latin 5 last June should

Fata per Aeneae iuro dextramque potentem

cause more than momentary hesitation?

The Chief in silence strode before.³

Suppose that the poet of the *L'Allegro* passage had been a feminist, and had written the last verse thus:

Stoutly strut his dames before.

Ability to distinguish a verb in the plural from a verb in the singular is all that is needed to understand at once the altered picture. The change in the function of the word "before" causes no difficulty at all.

Can a pupil, if intelligent, see in advance as he reads a sentence the idea, though not necessarily the exact words, with which that sentence must reasonably close? Yes, in not a few cases.

Th' applause of list'ning senates to command,
The threats of pain and ruin to despise,
To scatter plenty o'er a smiling land,
And read their history in a nation's eyes,

Their lot forbad. . . .⁴

The last three words might have been different, but not the general idea. For eight stanzas Gray has been describing "their destiny obscure." The close of the following is in like fashion inevitable.

¹ *Marmion*, V, 31.

³ *Lady of the Lake*, V, 11.

² *L'Allegro*.

⁴ *Elegy Written in a Country Churchyard*.

. . . Yet not the more
 Cease I to wander where the Muses haunt
 Clear spring, or shady grove, or sunny hill,
 Smit with the love of sacred song; but chief
 Thee, Sion, and the flowery brooks beneath,
 That wash thy hallowed feet, and warbling flow,
 Nightly I visit. . . .¹

Read the third and fourth stanzas of *Lycidas* and see how confidently one may predict the verse

Fanning their joyous leaves to thy soft lays.

Let us return to the Latin. As one reads the opening paragraph of the first speech against Catiline and declaims to himself the fourth sentence with its six times repeated *nihil*, is he not sure, long before he reaches it, of the general idea of the verb with which the indignant question must close? *Patere tua consilia non sentis? Constrictam iam . . .* The reader knows full well what is coming. "We've got you, Catiline, because we know everything (*patere tua consilia* is repeated in *horum omnium scientia*); don't you see it?" (How much do we know?) *Quid proxima, quid superiore noctem egeris, ubi fueris, quos convocaveris, quid consili ceperis*—How will the speaker end? Inevitably with the idea, in whatever words it may be expressed, of *horum omnium scientia*, "we all know." Both sentences, like the five that precede, are cast in the interrogative form, and this, too, is practically inevitable.

Let me add two further instances from the paper in Latin 4 last June. *Quo igitur animo esse existimatis aut eos qui vectigalia nobis pensitant aut eos qui . . .* In the detailed argument which Cicero has for some time been making about the *vectigalia*, what two classes are most likely to be thus bracketed together? Surely those who have to pay and those who must collect in order not to lose money by their contract with the State. *Itaque, credo, si civis Romanus Archias legibus non esset.* The rest of this sentence, *ut ab aliquo imperatore civitate donaretur, perficere potuit* is practically inevitable, for Cicero has just told the jury that Pompey gave citizenship to Theophanes, *scriptorem rerum suarum*.

¹ *Paradise Lost*, Book III, ll. 26-32.

In these two sentences, as in hundreds of others, the course of Cicero's thought is so sequent that an alert intelligence cannot well lose the scent. The path too is well marked. The principle of balance is almost everywhere observable. This aspect of his style is so familiar to you all that I need not here enlarge upon it. I have recently read the whole of the speech *Pro Lege Manilia* with sole reference to this symmetrical grouping of facts and ideas, and I am convinced that Cicero has used it almost to excess. The path is often very simply marked, e.g., by *et . . . et, neque . . . neque, non solum . . . sed etiam, non tam . . . quam, non . . . sed, maiores nostri . . . vos*, or by connectives standing at or near the beginning of the sentence, *quae res, tamen, igitur, cum vero*; but the signboards are perhaps too numerous and too clear. One thinks at times, regretfully, of the pleasures of an intellectual cross-country tramp where one might now and then get lost, and be forced to use one's wits quite carefully in order not to stay lost.

As I pointed out in the early part of this paper, the tests used in the Army were devised to discover, together with other things, a man's ability "to analyze a situation and to maintain a state of mental alertness." It is obviously a new and unexpected situation that gives intelligence its opportunity. In war, as in ordinary life, intelligence is most conspicuously shown "under fire." It has been a matter of some pride that since 1911 the question papers in Latin showed no misprint. We were sore distressed, therefore, last June at the mistake in the numbering of the verses of the first passage for translation on Latin 5, Virgil. Let me say here in passing that the examiners recovered their peace of mind when they found that the final proof on file in Professor Fiske's office showed both numbers (95-100) in their correct position at the side of the passage. But of this the candidates were unaware. How then did they meet the unexpected and disturbing situation? The numbers at the righthand side indicated verses 93-102, the numbers at the end verses 92-101. "Mental alertness" was needed to discover which numbering was correct. Four of the questions involved specific Latin words, after each of which was placed in parentheses the number of the verse in which it stood. These four numbers all agreed with the numbers given at the end of the

passage, viz., 92-101. If the numbers at the side were right, there were six misprints, four of them in four separate questions. If, however, these numbers were right, the two numbers at the side were misplaced. I submit that the "mental alertness," desiderated by the Army tests, should have "analyzed the situation" correctly. But "mental alertness" seems to be put to flight by the artillery of examinations. Of course, no candidate was allowed to suffer because of the dislocation of the side numbers.

One question upon the paper in Cicero deserves some special comment. "Describe the method of collecting the *vectigalia* of the province of Asia; and explain in this connection why *familiae* were kept *in saltibus*, *in agris*, and *in portubus atque custodiis*." You will recall that Cicero devotes sections 14-19 inclusive (two and one-half pages out of thirty, Oxford text) to a detailed discussion of the stability of the Roman financial system as affected by the war. He has already (in sections 14 and 15) said: *Asia vero tam opima est ac fertilis ut et ubertate agrorum et varietate fructuum et magnitudine pastionis et multitudine earum rerum quae exportentur facile omnibus terris antecellat. . . . Nam cum hostium copiae non longe absunt, etiam si inruptio nulla facta est, tamen pecuaria relinquitur, agri cultura deseritur, mercatorum navigatio conquiescit. Ita neque ex portu neque ex decumis neque ex scriptura vectigalia conservari potest.* He has thus already three times explicitly described the three sources of revenue that in the passage set last June for translation he again describes for the fourth time by the phrases *in saltibus*, *in agris*, and *in portubus atque custodiis*. The candidate has just defined in his translation the two classes that are endangered by the war, *aut eos qui vectigalia nobis pensitant aut eos qui exercent atque exigunt*. I have just examined again the notes on these sections of ten school editions of Cicero's *Orations*, including, I think, all that are widely used. All ten editions give clear and definite notes upon the three kinds of taxes, eight of the ten state that the *familiae* were the agents or assistants of the *publicani* in collecting these taxes, and seven of the ten distinguish by translation into English *exercent* from *exigunt*, adding that the first word refers to the *publicani* who make the contracts with the state, and the second to their agents who actually collect the money.

Like so many other questions that appear upon these papers, this question that I am now discussing sought to ascertain whether the candidate was dealing in his translation with words, or with facts and ideas. A correct answer involved nothing beyond a reasonable understanding of the concrete meaning for Roman life of the words which he had just translated. The question was poorly answered, and revealed striking ignorance of the relation of the *publicani* to the state and to the tax-payer, of the function of the *familiae* as the fiscal agents of the *publicani*, and of the three sources of revenue which, as I have reminded you, Cicero specifically describes four times within the limits of a single page of the Oxford Text. The *publicani* were not interested in landscape. They kept their *familiae* in three kinds of places for professional reasons, and if they had agents in each place, it was because each place had necessarily its own business significance.

Let me give you one example of an unintelligent answer: "The families were kept in marshes, fields, and safe places so that they could escape these wicked tax-collectors, and also to evade the armies of Mithridates and Tigranes."

Sulla's activities as a salesman were remarkable. One of the readers collected the following list:

"Sulla was selling—offices in the province—souvenirs for the benefit of the soldiers—citizenships—works of poets—possessions of a man who had run into debt—rewards to the people—assignments to the different provinces—patents to the Romans—public offices—centurionships—many copies of the writing of the poets. Sulla was exchanging money of the different foreign nations. Sulla had at one time been a sort of peddler (*sic*). Sulla demanded tribute of him, saying that he had no right to go there and sell his verses for so much money because he was not a Roman citizen. Sulla bought all the books which he had on his stand. Sulla was praetor and therefore auctioneer. Sulla allowed the poems of the wicked to be sold in the public places of the city."

One of the readers made the following list of the *duo reges*: "Mithrades, Mithridates king of Syria, Tiranés, Tyghrenes, Tigranes king of Tigranocerta, Tigranes and his son-in-law Mithradates, Ariobarzanes, Arizzobanes, Antiochus III, Pompey, Lucullus,

Crassus, Murena, Julius Caesar and Augustus Caesar, Marius, Sulla, Sertorius, Jugurtha, Spartacus, Ariovistus, Pyrrhus, Archimedes, Cyrus, Artaxerxes, Datis, Alexander, Attila, Nicomedes, Appius, Agamemnon, Astyanax, Pontus, Numidicus, Cyzicus, Regius, Arzontheus, Andramitus, Siaticus."

Listen now to two good answers.

"*Fato*: Death by fate would be a natural death, in which she had no power at all. If the gods decreed that she should die, it would be death by fate. There were three Fates or *Parcae*—one which held the distaff, one which spun the thread of life, and one which cut it off. *Merita morte*: refers to death that may or may not have been planned by the Fates. Had Dido done anything contrary or displeasing to the will of the gods, she would have merited death even though the Fates had not thus decreed it for her. The *merita morte* depends more directly on the will of the gods and on her manner of life."

"From the passage assigned we gain the idea that Aeneas was not afraid of death. He envied those who had been able to die gloriously. He thought that those men who had died there were much better off than he, who had lived. The idea expressed by Vergil is precisely that of Coningsby Dawson in *Carry On*, namely, the man who dies in a glorious cause on a battlefield dies in a moment of elevation of character at the height of his career. As Dawson says, Aeneas' idea was 'It doesn't matter when or where you die, but how and for what cause.'"

In this last answer, with its impromptu correlation of ancient and modern feeling, that intelligence which is the subject of this paper is seen actively at work. Let us commend it, in all the forms in which it may display itself, to the fostering care of every teacher of Latin, and let us so commend it by our practice as well as by precept. Let us combine "information and training," grammar and intelligence. But let us never forget that the object of all education is "to render an intelligent being yet more intelligent." The acquisition of information is a means to this end. Except, perhaps, in the education of slaves, it is not an end in itself.

RHYTHM VERSUS RHYME¹

BY KARL P. HARRINGTON
Wesleyan University

In Professor Karl Breul's recent elegant edition of *The Cambridge Songs* he remarks that "only a few verse translations of certain poems have so far been made, in spite of the undoubted literary merit of at least a dozen of them," and adds:

It is hoped that the present edition of this earliest Latin songbook, made up from various sources by a versatile Rhenish goliard, may tempt some congenial spirit, after the lapse of nearly 900 years, to render *con amore* in one of the modern vernaculars all such of the old Cambridge Songs as are of undoubted literary value and of abiding human interest.

The latter qualities are certainly present in several of these poems, but, supposing an irresistible temptation to try his hand at this venture attacks a "congenial spirit," in what mood and tense shall he seek the divine afflatus so as to produce at least the impression that he has essayed the task "*con amore*"?

The only English patterns available for these particular poems appear to be, on the one hand, Philip Allen's prose version of the amorous complaint addressed by a Verona schoolmaster to the object of his affection, and, on the other, the dainty rendering by John Addington Symonds of the invitation extended by a young man to his lady love to come to a little supper at his apartments. The latter translation, found in the introduction to *Wine, Women and Song*, and beginning,

Come therefore now, my gentle fere,
Whom as my heart I hold full dear;
Enter my little room, which is
Adorned with quaintest rarities,

in ordinary "long-meter" rhymed couplets, is skilfully adapted to reproduce the original both in its keeping of the rhymed couplets

¹A paper read before the American Philological Association, at Columbia University, December 27, 1918.

and in its maintenance of about the same length of verse; since the original, a sort of crude anapaestic form, has usually nine syllables, and sometimes eight:

Iam, dulcis amica, venito,
quam sicut cor meum diligo;
Intra in cubiculum meum,
ornamentis cunctis onustum.

The problem is, however, not always so simple. The Latin meters are, to be sure, all based on an accentual reckoning and are frequently rhymed; but they include Sapphic strophes, six-verse Adonic stanzas, ordinary iambic dimeters, long sonorous trochaic tetrameters catalectic, and various more or less puzzling and formless "sequences." In the case of these sequences, indeed, one might well be pardoned if he cut the Gordian knot by resorting to that simplest solution of the question, English blank verse. But the desire to produce something less monotonous and more winning will in the study of most of the poems lead to some sort of an attempt to imitate in one way or another the forms of the original.

Taste and theories have differed widely in the notable examples available of English versions from Latin poets. At one extreme stands the *tour de force* of the late Robinson Ellis, in which are exactly reproduced, not only the feet, verses, and stanzas of the original in the English, but also even the un-English quantitative basis of the feet. Though we might hesitate to accept Ellis' own phrase forecasting the possible judgment of the critics, and call his work "an elaborate failure," the impression made all too often by his amazing ingenuity is that the result is more learned than pleasing; and even Ellis was forced to admit that he could not maintain consistency throughout in the endeavor to follow his own rules.

On the other hand, the most recent of the many translators of Horace, Mr. Cudworth, lays down a principle of certain arbitrary compromises. Granting that an approximation to the shape of the Horatian stanza is imperative, he declines on the one hand to imitate the rhythms of Horace but on the other hand insists on universal rhyme; and having fixed upon a verse-form that pleases him, to represent a given stanza of Horace, he maintains that

particular form without exception for every one of the original poems in that stanza. For example, the Alcaic strophe, Horace's favorite measure, which has verses of unequal length formed on a trochaic basis, a verse of highly artistic rhythmical variety, he translates in every one of the thirty-seven odes by the plain and monotonous iambic eight-syllable, or ordinary "long meter," English stanza, relying for relief only on the common end-rhyme between the first and third and the second and fourth verses. This method of procedure does scant justice to Horace's carefully worked-out stanzas. More attention to the rhythm and less to the rhyme would produce a much fairer and perhaps equally attractive reproduction of the original; for if we admit that no translation is really as good as its original, is not the corollary of that proposition that the purpose of an English translation should be to suggest the original, so far as is consistent with graceful and readable English? And if rhythm is an important element, especially in lyric poetry, is it not highly desirable, so far as possible, to recall in translation the rhythm of the original?

Of course the extent to which translation becomes paraphrase depends more or less upon the meter chosen; but, aside from that consideration, we must all acknowledge that for a mere reproduction of the thought of the author it makes little difference what meter is employed by a translator, so far as bringing out the thought is concerned. Take, for example, Horace's familiar Ode 9 of the first book, in the Alcaic measure, a lyric in which the poet in Epicurean mood invites an imaginary friend to join him in convivial defiance of the winter's cold without, and of the winter of old age that infallibly follows life's little summer day:

Vides ut alta stet nive candidum
Soracte, nec iam sustineant onus
silvae laborantes geluque
flumina constiterint acuto.

Mr. Cudworth puts it into this form:

See how Soracte's jutting crown
Looms white and deep with drifted snow;
Ice sags the laboring forests down;
Keen frost arrests the rivers' flow.

Let us try at random half a dozen other meters on it:

1. *Dactylic hexameter* (accentual, of course, following all modern verse-standards):

See how Soracte is covered with snow lying deep on the hillside!
Scarce can the trees bear their burden; the waters stand still in
their courses.

2. *Iambic dimeter* (double-rhymed):

Soracte stands so white and still,
Snow-covered deep upon its hill!
The forests toil to bear their load,
The stream's stock-still, a frozen road.

3. *Trochaic dimeter*, alternating with *trochaic dimeter catalectic* (second and fourth verses rhymed):

Look! how beautiful Soracte
Glistens 'neath its load of snow!
Trees are struggling with their burden;
Frozen streams no longer flow!

4. *Anapaestic trimeter* (double-rhymed):

Do you see how Soracte all white
Stands enwrapped with a mantle of snow,
While the trees find their burden not light,
And the cold, ice-checked streams cannot flow?

5. *The greater Asclepiad* (à la Horace, accentual, however, to remain *English* verse):

See! Soracte the fair || snow-covered mount || stands up against the sky,
While its forest-clad slopes || groan with their load, || nor can the streams
rush by.

6. Horace's own *Alcaic* (accentual basis, of course):

Behold Soracte! shrouded with snowy depths,
Its bending treetops groaning beneath their load,
Its babbling streams no longer vocal,
Tight in the grip of the keen ice-crystal!

The use of this original meter is adapted to reproduce the thought without padding to meet mere metrical exigencies; and it recalls to both eye and ear the stanza of Horace. In what way,

amid these superiorities, is it inferior to more familiar forms? It lacks rhyme, it may be said, and is cast in a less common mold than most English poetry; but can this be taken as a serious objection in an age when supposedly reputable periodicals purchase and print the prosaic drool dignified unduly by the name "free verse"? Rhyme is certainly an important and attractive feature of most mediaeval and modern verse, but it never has been recognized as an essential of poetry, as compared to rhythm. If in Latin lyrics rhythm plays a commanding part, it should certainly be a distinct merit, in any attempt to transfer the song into another tongue, that this rhythm should as far as possible be maintained, in preference to the introduction of any element like rhyme, which cuts no figure in the forms of which a version is being made.

The acceptance of such a criterion, that is, as close an approximation as possible to the form of the original, consistent with the ordinary laws of English verse, will involve varying degrees of difficulty due to the elaborateness of the original scheme, the intricacy of rhymes to be imitated, or the length of the verses employed. All these difficulties can be easily illustrated by examples taken from *The Cambridge Songs*, which we started to consider with a view of making some versions of them. No. 8 of the collection is a fragment of Rachel's lament for her children, in a four-verse stanza, the first three verses being fifteen-syllable trochaics with a caesura after the eighth syllable, and the fourth a fourteen-syllable trochaic with rhyming halves. Besides this there is end-rhyme throughout, each verse ending in the letter *a*. Additional refinements are onomatopoeitic alliteration and frequent assonance. The first stanza runs:

Pulsat astra planctu magno Rachel, plorans pignora,
queriturque consolari, quos necavit improba;
dolet, plangit, crines scindit ob sororis crimina.
uxor sine macula, casta servans viscera.

Some approximation to similar achievements in an English stanza might perhaps be reached by dint of much titillation of the scalp—possibly after some such fashion as this:

Weep the stars with woeful wailings for the woman Rachel's babes,
Who rejects all consolation for those slain by wicked knaves,
Grieving, sobbing, tresses tearing, at her sister's cruelty:
Spotless wife and mother she, faithful in her purity.

Even so, the pattern has varied slightly, in despair of perfect success in meeting the requirements. The scheme of uniform end-rhyme, by itself, can to be sure be followed. No. 18, for example, a congratulatory address to a queen just recovered from illness, begins:

Gaudet polus, ridet tellus, iocundantur omnia,
angelorum sacra canunt in excelsis agmina,
quorum psallit imitatrix in terris ecclesia;
mundus plaudit et resultat letus de te, regina;

which may be rendered:

Heaven and earth are full of gladness, gaiety is everywhere,
Bands of holy angels singing anthems in the upper air,
While the church on earth is chanting hymns in emulation rare:
Thee, O queen, the earth applauds, exultingly, now freed from care.

Even some of the "sequences" admit of a fair amount of imitation in form. No. 13, a dirge on the death of Emperor Henry II, has a four-verse stanza of general trochaic character, with middle-and-end rhyme (frequently two-syllabled), and a one-verse refrain in dactylic hexameter. It begins:

Lamentémur nóstra, sócií peccáta;
lamentémur ét plorémus; quáre tacémus?
Pró iniquitate córruimus láte;
scimus celi hinc offénsu[m] régem inménsu[m].
Heinricó requiém, rex Chríste, dona perhennem!

Similarly we may write:

Let us be lamenting, for our sins repenting,
As we sorrow for our failings, why hush our wailings?
Through our sad wrongdoing ruin has been brewing,
Hence to God, by deed unfounded, offense unbounded.
Grant to Henry, Christ, King Omnipotent, rest everlasting!

No. 17, Wipo's dirge for Conrad II, combines rude trochaics and iambs with middle-and-end rhyme and a fifth verse refrain in trochaics:

Qui habét vocém serénam hanc proferat cantilénam
de anno lamentábili et damno ineffábili,
pro quo dolet omnis homo forinsecus ét in domo,
suspirat populus domnum vigilando ét per somnum:
Rex deus, vivos tuere ét defunctis miserere!

Under these circumstances one may feel at liberty to use consistently either iambic or trochaic verse, provided he adheres otherwise to the general form, and may therefore write:

Let him who hath a voice serene sing forth this mournful cantilene,
Bewail the year lamentable, our loss sad and ineffable,
For whom there grieveth every soul at home and through the country's
whole!

The people for their ruler sigh, waking, or if in sleep they lie:
O God, our King, save those who live, and to the dead thy mercy give!

No. 16, the coronation ode for Henry III, refuses to be confined within any hard-and-fast rhythmical bounds but maintains middle-and-end rhyme quite consistently. As a kind of rude Adonic seems to be the basic measure on which the half-verses are founded, perhaps it might be allowable to keep that form steadily in the translation; but in so short a metrical unit rhyme becomes exceedingly difficult to carry on and may be omitted. The poem begins:

Ó rex regum qui, sólus in évum
regnas in celis Heínricum, nobis
serva in terris ab inimicis;

and a version may not unfittingly go thus:

O King of all kings, who alone ever
Reignest in heaven, save for us Henry
From every foeman throughout earth's borders!
Him thou hast chosen for thy rich blessing
And coronation at Aquasgranum,
Done by the hands of Archbishop Pilgrim.
O King of all kings, etc.

But when one reaches No. 5, a resurrection hymn built of antiphonal hexameters, highly alliterative, suddenly interrupted by three long lines of question and answer in prose, and concluding with an elegiac distich, he throws up his hands in palpable defeat and suggests prose as the medium of expression in such a case! The sonorous verses begin:

Hec est clara dies, clararum clara dierum,
hec est sancta dies, sanctorum sancta dierum,
nobile nobilium rutilans diadema dierum.

No doubt a version could be constructed along parallel lines, but it may be doubted if the product would be sufficiently homogeneous to make it worth while.

The difficulties which a very short, or a very long, verse throws about rhyme may be seen by an example of each extreme. No. 29 recounts with gentle satire in Adonics the story of the nun Alfraed and her pet she-ass, beginning:

Est unus locus
Hoinburh dictus
in quo pascebat
asinam Alfrád
viribus fortem
atque fidelem.

Now if the attempt is made to reproduce this measure in English with the rhyme, two perplexities arise: (1) The accent calls for a double rhyme most naturally in English, unless one is willing to rhyme the unaccented syllable alone, a proceeding which is liable to disturb the rhythm. (2) If so much of each verse is taken up with necessarily rhymed syllables, there is small leeway left for the accurate expression of the rest of the thought. A language like Latin, of regular inflectional character, makes final-syllable rhyme easy, as compared with English; but the double rhyme is rather cramped in such narrow quarters. In the following version of the poem it may be seen how various modes work out, double-rhyme, single-rhyme, different arrangements of occasional rhyme, and consistent rhythm without the rhyme, which latter form seems perhaps here again to vindicate its claim as a superior one to give a fair reminiscence of the original:

I

There is a city
Which in my ditty
Homburg is called.
There dwelt with Alfraed
A sturdy she-ass,
Faithful in her class.

II

As the ass scampers
Over the campus,
Lo, a wolf running,
Hungry and cunning!
Her head she fended,
But tail extended.

III

Up runs the bad wolf,
Bites the poor tail off!
Whereupon each hoof
Struck out in full proof,
Wolves she could still fight,
Even in that plight.

IV

When her strength she felt
Gradually failing,
Loud brayed the donkey
With a great wailing,
Thus with her last breath
Her mistress hailing.

V

At the cries noisy
The ass was making
Alfraed came quickly,
"Sisters," exclaiming,
"Hurry to help me,
Help me in this thing.

VI

"My precious donkey
Out in the pasture
I can hear bawling,
Mournfully calling.
I 'spec she's fighting
Some cruel wolf there."

VII

The sisters' screaming
Heard in the cloister
Brought out a big crowd,
Men-folks and women,
Hoping to catch the
Wolf all red-handed.

VIII

Sister Adela
Called in Rikila;
Agatha she found;
So Alfraed's sisters
Rushed to lay prostrate
This foe so lusty.

IX

Meanwhile the beast ate
 Ribs of the she-ass,
 Swallowed the carcass,
 Drank at a great rate
 All the blood reeking—
 The woods then seeking.

X

When all the sisters
 Beheld him vanish,
 Tearing their hair out,
 Beating their bosoms,
 Mourned they for this poor
 Innocent donkey.

XI

Alfraed then got a
 Nice little coltie;
 Petted him gently,
 Shed fond tears for him,
 Hoping in some way
 He would have offspring!

XII

Gentle Adela
 And sweet Fritherun
 Both came to strengthen
 Her expectations,
 Comfort and cheer thus
 Kindly imparting:

XIII

"Sister, forget her!
 Do not regret her!
 No wolf-like critter
 Heeds tears, though bitter.
 God will provide a
 She-ass just like her!"

The other extreme of length is seen in No. 31, a poem on the nightingale, in fifteen-syllabled trochaics, beginning,

Aurea personet lira clara modulamina!

Every one of the forty-eight verses ends in the letter *a*. If we disregard that, however, and use merely rhymed couplets, we find that the chief trouble lies in the fact that we have usually space to spare after translating every word, and are tempted to pad the verses somewhat, since it does not take as many syllables in English, as a rule, to convey a given idea, as in Latin. On the whole, however, the difficulty is not very serious, as it tends rather to enrich than to impoverish the version. After the introduction the main theme of the poem is attacked as follows:

Cum telluris vere nova producantur germina
nemorosa circumcirca frondescunt et brachia,
flagrat odor quam suavis florida per gramina,
hilarescit philomela, dulcis vocis conscia;
et extendens modulando gutturi spiramina,
reddit voces. ac estivi temporis ad otia
instat nocti et diei voce sub dulcisona;
soporatis dans quietem cantus per discrimina,
nec non pulchra viatori laboris solatia, etc.

A version might run thus:

When in springtime tender buds burst forth, new progeny of earth,
When in woodland nooks the branches bring their foliage to birth,
With a perfume how delicious through the flowery meads and brakes,
Conscious of her gift of song, the nightingale to gladness wakes,
Tests her throat with constant practice, opens up her dainty thrills,
Lifts once more her voice melodious, summer's peaceful moments fills,
Pouring forth her notes mellifluous in the day and in the night,
Sweetening slumber for the sleeping, ordering the tones aright,
And the traveler's weary footsteps comforting with beauty rare, etc.

The mediaeval Sapphic strophe was commonly entirely accentual. Such Sapphics should be translated into accentual Sapphics of like form. Thus No. 30, describing summer, and beginning,

Vestiunt silve tenera merorem
virgulta suis onerata pomis;
canunt de celsis sedibus palumbes
carmina cunctis,

may be rendered after the same pattern,

Delicate leafage clothes the sylvan shadows,
Low droop the branches with their fruitage laden;
From their high perches gently croon the pigeons
Songs for all comers.

It is by methods such as these that the mood of the original is best transmuted into English, and the illusion of antiquity or mediaevalism is best preserved.

Notes

[Contributions in the form of notes or discussions should be sent to John A. Scott, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.]

SIDON AND THE SIDONIANS IN HOMER

Practically all the commentators of Homer have noticed the fact that Tyre and the Tyrians are not mentioned in either of the Homeric poems, and that the inhabitants of Phoenicia are either called Phoenicians or Sidonians. The Sidonians being peculiarly the people who produced fine raiment and artistic metal work.

Gladstone, *Homer and His Age*, p. 177, undertook to date the poems by assuming that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* must have been composed before Tyre became prominent.

Papenheim, *Philologus*, Supplementband 2, p. 44, assumes that the poet is reproducing a tradition prior to 1208 B.C. for he dates the eclipse of Sidon in that year, and he thus assumes the poet or poets intentionally archaizes.

Finsler, *Homer*, p. 18, is likewise of the opinion that Homer tries to reproduce a condition which was far anterior to his own times, since in the age during which the poems came into being Tyre was the great city of Phoenicia; "In der Zeit, aus der die homerischen Gedichte stammen, war Sidon längst von Tyros in den Schatten gestellt."

The last edition of Christ's *Gr. Lit. Gesch.*, p. 66, also asserts that Homer in calling the Phoenicians Sidonians instead of Tyrians is trying to reach back into a remote past, "in weit frühere Vergangenheit zurückreichen."

The substance of these comments is that Homer should have referred to Tyre and the Tyrians, and not exclusively to the Sidonians, if he were really describing the conditions of his own time.

Fortunately there are parallel and intimate accounts of the Phoenicians, which are uninfluenced by the poems of Homer, and the Bible which contains these accounts belongs to the same age as Homer whether we make him a contemporary with the fall of Troy or with the life of Archilochus. In all parts of the Bible written before the seventh century B.C. the word Sidonian equals Phoenician. Hiram, the friend of Solomon and therefore early in the tenth century, was king of Tyre, yet his people are called Sidonians, I Kings 5:6, and in the same book chap. 11, vss. 1, 5, and 33, the Phoenicians are called Sidonians, for it is clear that in each passage the entire nation is included, the inhabitants of Tyre as well as of Sidon.

Professor Eiselen in his book on *Sidon*, Vol. IV, "Columbia University Studies," has shown with his characteristic thoroughness that the usage of the

Bible is exactly the same as it is known to be in *Homer*, p. 18. "In the Old Testament the terms Sidon and Sidonians occur in thirty-eight passages, of these probably not a single passage older than the seventh century B.C. refers to the city of Sidon. Sidonian was equivalent to Phoenician."

In not a single passage in the Bible are the inhabitants of Tyre or any part of Phoenicia called Tyrians, at least Young's *Concordance* gives no example of that word.

The cool assumption that Homer pictures a condition which ceased at 1208 B.C. with a hypothetical collapse of Sidon and a corresponding rise of Tyre is without basis of fact, since sacred and profane history show that Sidon maintained her prominence until well in the seventh century.

Sidon was a dominating city of Phoenicia until overthrown by Sennacherib, and even this overthrow seems to have been only partial, for on the death of that monarch Sidon attempted a revolt which was frustrated by his successor, Esarhaddon, who destroyed the city utterly in 677 B.C. The city must have been of great importance at that time for the king in the inscription in which he boasts of his victory says: "The treasure of his palace, in great quantities I carried away. His men, who were without number I brought to Assyria."

Professor Eiselen, p. 55: "The destruction of Sidon by Esarhaddon could not have been more complete. The inhabitants of Sidon who managed to escape probably fled to Tyre. The deities and sacred traditions of their native city they carried with them, and Tyre became the sole heir of everything that survived that awful catastrophe."

All this is a beautiful vindication of Homer, the poet, and proves that he was no archaizer, and also that he used the conditions of his own day as the background for his poems.

The employment of the term Sidonian as an equivalent for Phoenician proves only that Homer pictured the conditions as they existed prior to 677 B.C.

Any theory which sees in Homer a historian, a theologian, or an archaeologist is wide of the mark, for his sole aim was poetry, with incidentally the poet's reward in marketable wares.

JOHN A. SCOTT

SOME CORSICAN ILLUSTRATIONS OF GREEK LITERATURE

The Reminiscences of Raphael Pumpelly,¹ one of the most delightful of recent biographies, is not without some passages of special interest for the Hellenist. One of the earliest of the author's unusual adventures was a somewhat casual trip to Corsica which extended to an exploration of that wildly picturesque island, in the company of Corsican peasants and shepherds. He reports that the shepherds lived in the "Homeric state of culture." Their manner of life seems to have some striking analogies with that of the Cyclops, rather than with that of the civilized Achaeans. "It came to my mind," he

¹ *My Reminiscences*, by Raphael Pumpelly. New York: Holt, 1918.

says, "that I had dropped into a stage of society that had come down unchanged from remotest time: for these people were self-sufficient, needing absolutely nothing beyond what their own efforts produced—cheese, milk, and clothing from their goats and sheep, and bread from their own chestnut trees" (Vol. I, p. 71). For supper they offered him sheep's milk in a wooden pail, from which the dog drank after he had finished. In the morning the shepherd gave him *braccio* (Vol. I, p. 73) "a neat basket-bowl filled with a snowy-white substance lying on leaves. It looked something like our cottage cheese, but it was a dish for the gods. It was made in some way by curdling the fresh, sweet milk of sheep." This seems like the delicious *giaourt* which the traveler in Greece and Turkey enjoys. But did not Polyphemus drink ewes' milk for supper, perhaps from a wooden pail like the Corsican's? and did he not curdle half the milk and put it away "in woven baskets" (Odyssey ix. 246-49)?

αὐτίκα δ' ἤμουν μὲν θρέψας λευκοῖο γάλακτος
πλεκτοῖς ἐν ταλάροισιν ἀμυσάμενος κατέθηκεν,
ἤμουν δ' αὐτ' ἔστησεν ἐν ἄγγεσιν, ὅφρα οἱ εἴη
πίνειν αἰνυμένῳ καὶ οὐ ποτιδόρπιον εἶη

Among the dramatic—and usually tragic—stories of Corsican vendetta which Mr. Pumpelly relates is one which presents a parallel to the tradition of Antigone (Vol. I, p. 140). It is too long to be repeated here: but briefly, it tells of a young woman who stole the body of her lover, which had been publicly exposed after his execution for conspiracy; and after dragging it to the altar of the church, removed single-handed the heavy slab which closed the man's family tomb, and laid the body within.

In a more general sense the whole book is a classical parallel. Raphael Pumpelly, geologist, explorer, archaeologist, is a sort of modern Odysseus, a man of many devices, who has seen the cities and learned the minds of many men, from Corsica to Arizona, from the Rocky Mountains to Turkestan. One of the last enterprises of his long and active life has been the search for the beginnings of Indo-European civilization on the plains of Central Asia.

SIDNEY N. DEANE

SMITH COLLEGE

CAESAR vi. 23

"Robberies carry no reproach, provided they be committed outside their own territories." Mr. B. W. Mitchell in his article on "Ariovistus and William II" (*Classical Journal*, February, 1919) has used this passage to show that robbery and plundering were characteristic of the Germans in ancient as well as in modern times. Had he desired, more of this ancient evidence could have been collected, for it is well known and has often been cited, not however to show the peculiar wickedness of the Germans, but rather the character of primitive society to which they then, and perhaps more recently, belonged.

The point was properly made by Grotius, in his work *De Jure Belli et Pacis* (II, 15, 15, note), to illustrate the statement in his text, that in primitive times it was considered lawful to commit robbery and to drive away plunder from foreigners without declaration of war. The translation of the note with insertion of references to chapters and sections follows:

Caesar says of the Germans (*B.G.* vi. 23. 6), "Robberies committed outside of the boundaries of the state occasion no disgrace." Tacitus is added as a witness (*Germania* 14. 6, and 26. 2), and Saxo (*Gesta Danorum*, Book xiv, pp. 259-60 and elsewhere: v, pp. 159, 170; xiv, p. 310, etc.). Likewise Servius to Virgil's *Aeneid* has written about the Etruscans (viii. 479; x. 184) and other peoples (i. 317, 527). Diodorus Siculus (v. 34. 6) says the same of the Lusitanians, and with him Plutarch agrees (*Marius*, 6, p. 408): "Up to the present robbery is considered among the most noble professions." Similar is the fact that the Jews deny that loss ought to be made good which has been caused to one who is neither a Jew nor allied to the Jews (*Baba Kama*, 1, 2, p. 13).

This general feeling about brigandage has survived until modern times among some peoples or in some localities. A good illustration is the rage the Greeks felt at Edmond About's *Le Roi des Montagnes*, the satire of which they did not grasp, through fear that the exaggeration might be believed to be the truth.

H. A. SANDERS